arXiv:1109.2365v1 [math.AC] 12 Sep 2011

The weak Lefschetz property for Artinian graded rings and basic sequences

Mutsumi Amasaki

Graduate School of Education, Hiroshima University,
1-1-1 Kagamiyama, Higashi-Hiroshima 739-8524, Japan
E-mail : `amasaki@hiroshima-u.ac.jp`

September 9, 2011

Abstract

The basic sequence of a homogeneous ideal $I \subset R = k[x_1, \dots, x_r]$ defining an Artinian graded ring $A = R/I$ not having the weak Lefschetz property has the property that the first term of the last part is less than the last term of the penultimate part. For a general linear form ℓ in $x_1, \dots, x_r$, this fact affects in a certain way the behavior of the $r - 1$ square matrices in $k[\ell]$ which represent the multiplications of the elements of A by $x_1, \dots, x_{r-1}$ through a minimal free presentation of A over $k[\ell]$. Taking advantage of it, we consider some modules over an algebra generated over $k[\ell]$ by the square matrices mentioned above. In this manner, for the case $r = 3$, we prove that an Artinian Gorenstein graded ring $A = k[x_1, x_2, x_3]/I$ has the weak Lefschetz property if $\mathrm{char}(k) = 0$ and the number of the minimal generators of $0 :_A \ell$ over $k[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ is two.

Introduction

From the viewpoint of standard free resolutions (see [2, Section 3]), homogeneous ideals defining curves in $\mathbf{P}^3$ and homogeneous ideals in a polynomial ring $k[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ defining Artinian graded rings can be treated in the same manner to a certain extent. We have recently found a way to apply the method developed in [5] to the study of the weak Lefschetz property for Artinian Gorenstein graded rings.

In [5] the structure of the standard free resolutions itself was the main theme and the results were expressed in terms of basic sequences (see [3, Section 2], [4, Section 1] or [2, Section 1] for the definition of basic sequence). In this paper we examine the behavior of a ring not having the weak Lefschetz property by analyzing a part of its structure which

---

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 13D02, 13H10; Secondary 13P10.

is affected by the basic sequence of its defining ideal. In contrast to [5], our arguments are carried out in a way that does not depend too much on computations of the relation matrices appearing in the standard free resolutions, though most of our ideas stem out of observations of them. In that manner we can prove that an Artinian Gorenstein graded ring $A := k[x_1, x_2, x_3]/I$ has the weak Lefschetz property if $\mathrm{char}(k) = 0$ and the number of the minimal generators of $0 :_A \ell$ over $k[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ is two for a general linear form ℓ (see Theorem 5.11). Our results include the case of height three Artinian complete intersections treated in [7, Theorem 2.3] and the case where $\min\{ \ l \mid [I]_l \neq 0 \ \} = 2$ treated in [9, Corollary 3.2].

Let us explain the main points shortly. Let $R := k[x_1, \ldots, x_r]$ be a polynomial ring over an infinite field k and I a homogeneous ideal in R such that $A := R/I$ is an Artinian graded ring. We assume that $x_1, \ldots, x_r$ are chosen sufficiently generally. In our proof, we consider a minimal free resolution

$$0 \longrightarrow F \xrightarrow{\Phi} L \xrightarrow{\pi} A \longrightarrow 0 \tag{1}$$

of A over $R^\star := k[x_r]$ with homogeneous homomorphisms Φ and π of degree zero, where $F := \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m_r} R^\star(-n_i^r)$, $L := \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m_r} R^\star(\kappa_i)$, $(n_1^r, \ldots, n_{m_r}^r)$ is the last part of the basic sequence $(a; n_1^2, \ldots, n_a^2; \cdots ; n_1^r, \ldots, n_{m_r}^r)$ of I (see [3, Section 2]), and $\kappa_1, \ldots, \kappa_{m_r}$ is a nondecreasing sequence of integers. For each $1 \leq j \leq r-1$, let X_j be a matrix with components in $R^\star$ giving a homogeneous linear map $X_j : L(-1) \longrightarrow L$ of degree zero which represents the linear map $\times x_j : A(-1) \longrightarrow A$ over $R^\star$. Then L and $\mathrm{Im}(\Phi)$ are modules over the $R^\star$ algebra $R^\star[X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1}]$ generated by $X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1}$. We see that A has the weak Lefschetz property if and only if $n_{m_r}^r \geq n_{m_{r-1}}^{r-1}$ by Lemma 4.6 and that something special happens to the $R^\star[X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1}]$ module L by Theorem 2.1 if $n_{m_r}^r < n_{m_{r-1}}^{r-1}$. In the case where A is Gorenstein of dimension zero, $\mathrm{char}(k) = 0$, $r = 3$, and the number of the minimal generators of $0 :_A \ell$ over R is two, we are led to a contradiction by the above two facts if A does not have the weak Lefschetz property, estimating the length of a certain submodule of $\mathrm{Hom}_k(A/x_3A, k) = \mathrm{Ext}^2_{R/(x_3)}(A/x_3A, R/(x_3))(-2)$ in two ways, one by using (1) tensored with $R/(x_3)$ and the other by using the minimal free resolution of A/x_3A over $R/(x_3)$. See Theorem 5.11 for the detail.

This paper is organized as follows.

In the first two sections, we consider an R module E which is finitely generated over $R^\star := k[x_{\rho+1}, \ldots, x_r]$ $(1 \leq \rho < r)$ with focus on the degrees of its minimal generators over $R^\star$. Let

$$\cdots \longrightarrow F \xrightarrow{\Phi} L \xrightarrow{\pi} E \longrightarrow 0$$

be a minimal free resolution of E over $R^\star$, where $F := \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q'} R^\star(-\kappa'_i)$, $L := \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R^\star(\kappa_i)$, and $\kappa_1, \ldots, \kappa_Q$ and $\kappa'_1, \ldots, \kappa'_{Q'}$ are nondecreasing sequences of integers. Let further X_j be a matrix with components in $R^\star$ giving a homogeneous linear map $X_j : L(-1) \longrightarrow L$ of degree zero representing the linear map $\times x_j : E(-1) \longrightarrow E$ over $R^\star$ for each $1 \le j \le \rho$. Under this setting, we can apply the method developed in [5, Section 3], which makes use of the fact that the above sequences of integers do not vary when a small change of variables $x_1, \dots, x_r$ is performed. One of our major results here is Theorem 2.1 which says that, for every p satisfying $\kappa_p < \kappa_{p+1}$, we have $W^\nu \left[\mathrm{Im}(\mathit{\Phi})\right]_{\le -\kappa_p} \subset N_p$ for all $\nu \ge 0$, where $W := X_1 + \sum_{j=2}^{\rho} s_j X_j$ $(s_2, \dots, s_\rho \in k)$, $\left[\mathrm{Im}(\mathit{\Phi})\right]_{\le -\kappa_p} := \sum_{d \le -\kappa_p} \left[\mathrm{Im}(\mathit{\Phi})\right]_d$, and N_p denotes the submodule of L consisting of all of its elements whose first p components are zero. This theorem and the results derived from it play crucial roles in the whole paper.

The basic sequence of a module is the sequence of the degrees, lined up in a certain rule, of generators forming a Weierstrass basis of the given module with respect to sufficiently general $x_1, \dots, x_r$ (see [3, Section 2]). It is therefore natural that Weierstrass bases appear in our argument frequently. But, in some cases the conditions imposed on a Weierstrass basis are too restrictive. For this reason, we will use in this paper a basis satisfying relaxed conditions, which we shall call a pseudo Weierstrass basis. Section three is devoted to a description of its fundamental properties.

In section four some results on the exact sequences (1) for Artinian Gorenstein graded rings are described in detail. At the same time we look into the structure of the $R^\star[X_1, \dots, X_{r-1}]$ modules L and $\mathrm{Im}(\mathit{\Phi})$ a little.

The main theorem of this paper is proved in section five (see Theorem 5.11). There, we work over an Artinian Gorenstein graded ring $A = R/I$ such that $r = 3$ and the number of the minimal generators of $0 :_A x_3$ over R is two, assuming $\mathrm{char}(k) = 0$. We first investigate the properties of the minimal free resolution of $I + (x_3)/(x_3)$ over $R/(x_3)$ and that of I over R. Then, combining the results obtained in section four, we reach our goal.

In the final section, the basic sequence of a complete intersection of three homogeneous polynomials is described.

§1. A property coming from invariance under small homogeneous transformations of variables

The principal idea of the arguments of this section has already been presented in [5, Section 3] for studying a special case. We will enhance it to a more general formulation with some modifications.

Throughout this paper, let $y_1, \dots, y_r$ denote indeterminates over an infinite field k, R the polynomial ring $k[y_1, \dots, y_r]$, $\mathfrak{m}$ the maximal ideal $(y_1, \dots, y_r)$, γ_{ij} $(1 \le i \le r,\ 1 \le j \le r)$ elements of k such that the matrix $\mathit{\Gamma} := (\gamma_{ij})$ is invertible, and $x_1, \dots, x_r$ elements of R satisfying $y_i = \sum_{j=1}^{r} \gamma_{ji} x_j$ $(1 \le i \le r)$. Given a matrix $\varXi$ in R, the set consisting of all the linear combinations of the columns of $\varXi$ over a ring *Ring* will be denoted by $\mathrm{Im}^{Ring}(\varXi)$. For modules E, E' and E'', the symbol $\oplus$ will be used in the following two senses: (i) $E' \oplus E'' = \{\ (e', e'') \mid e' \in E',\ e'' \in E''\ \}$, (ii) $E' \subset E,\ E'' \subset E,\ E' \cap E'' = 0,\ E' \oplus E'' = \{\ e' + e'' \mid e' \in E',\ e'' \in E''\ \} \subset E$. Usually the context will make it clear which it means. But in some cases, we will use another symbol $\dot{\oplus}$ instead of $\oplus$ to express the direct sum in the first sense. The (Q, Q) unit matrix will be denoted by 1_Q and $\mathrm{MAT}(R^\star)$ will denote the set of matrices with entries in $R^\star$.

Let $\kappa_1, \ldots, \kappa_Q$ be a nondecreasing sequence of integers, ρ an integer with $1 \le \rho < r$, and $\varTheta_j$ $(1 \le j \le \rho)$ matrices giving homogeneous homomorphisms

$$\varTheta_j : \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R(\kappa_i - 1) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R(\kappa_i)$$

of degree zero such that the components of $X_i := x_i 1_Q - \varTheta_i$ lie in $R^\star := k[x_{\rho+1}, \ldots, x_r]$. Suppose there are positive integers $p,\ q$ with $1 \le p < Q,\ 1 \le q \le Q - p$ satisfying $\kappa_p < \kappa_{p+1}$ and $q = \max\{\ i \mid \kappa_{p+1} = \cdots = \kappa_{p+i},\ p + i \le Q\ \}$. Take elements $s_j \in k$ $(2 \le j \le \rho)$ and put $z_1 := x_1 + \sum_{j=2}^{\rho} s_j x_j$, $W := X_1 + \sum_{j=2}^{\rho} s_j X_j$, $\varOmega := z_1 1_Q - W = \varTheta_1 + \sum_{j=2}^{\rho} s_j \varTheta_j$.

Let

$$\varOmega =: \begin{bmatrix} C' & C'' & C''' \\ D' & D'' & D''' \end{bmatrix}, \quad U' := \begin{bmatrix} C'' & C''' \\ D'' & D''' \end{bmatrix}, \quad U'' := \begin{bmatrix} C'' \\ D'' \end{bmatrix},$$

where the number of the rows of $(C'\ C''\ C''')$ (resp. $(D'\ D''\ D''')$) is p (resp. $Q - p$), and the numbers of the columns of D', D'' and D''' are p, q and $Q - p - q$ respectively. Notice that for each row of U'' the degrees of its components are the same and that C'' is a matrix whose components are zero or of degree zero in $z_1, x_{\rho+1}, \ldots, x_r$. Besides, $C''' = 0$ since the degrees its components must be negative. Choose $V_1 \in GL(q, k)$ so that the columns of $C''V_1$ different from zero are linearly independent over k.

Put

$$V_2 := \begin{bmatrix} 1_p & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & V_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1_{Q-p-q} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad U := U' \begin{bmatrix} V_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1_{Q-p-q} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Observe that z_1 appears in U only in the form cz_1 with some $c \in k$. We may therefore write

$$U = z_1 U_1 + U_0, \tag{2}$$

where U_1 (resp. U_0) is a matrix with entries in k (resp. $R^\star$). Let S denote the graded module $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R(\kappa_i)$ and $\deg(v)$ the degree of an element $v \in S$. We will regard the columns of U as homogeneous elements of S. Note that the degrees of the first q columns of U are the same and equal to $-\kappa_{p+1}+1$, while the degrees of the remaining columns are smaller than that. Let $b_1, \dots, b_m$ be all the columns of U of degree $-\kappa_{p+1}+1$ which do not vanish modulo $(z_1, x_{\rho+1}, \dots, x_r)$, and denote the remaining columns of U by $a_1, \dots, a_n$, where $n := Q-p-m$. Actually, $\{b_1, \dots, b_m\}$ consists of all the columns b of $U''V_1$ such that at least one of the first p components of b is an element of k different from zero by the choice of V_1. On the other hand, $\deg(a_i) \le -\kappa_{p+1}+1 \le -\kappa_p$ for all $1 \le i \le n$ and the first p components of a_i $(1 \le i \le n)$ are zero. Notice that all the columns of U of degree $-\kappa_{p+1}+1$ vanish modulo $(z_1, x_{\rho+1}, \dots, x_r)$ when $\kappa_{p+1} > \kappa_p + 1$. In that case, $m = 0$ and $n = Q-p$. Let $b_i =: {}^t(b_{1i}, \dots, b_{Qi})$ and $b''_i := {}^t(b_{1i}, \dots, b_{pi})$. The components of b''_i lie in k and the vectors $b''_1, \dots, b''_m$ are linearly independent over k by the choice of V_1.

We construct a matrix H whose columns are $z_1^{\nu_1} x_{\rho+1}^{\nu_{\rho+1}} \cdots x_r^{\nu_r} a_i$ $(\nu_1 + \sum_{j=\rho+1}^{r} \nu_j + \deg(a_i) = -\kappa_p,\ 1 \le i \le n,\ \nu_1, \nu_{\rho+1}, \dots, \nu_r \ge 0)$ arranged in a suitable order. Observe that the first p rows of H are zero. Since $\mathit{\Omega} - z_1 1_Q \in \mathrm{MAT}(R^\star)$, we see $U' - \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 0 \\ z_1 1_{Q-p} \end{smallmatrix}\right] \in \mathrm{MAT}(R^\star)$, so that

$$V_2^{-1} U - \begin{bmatrix} O \\ z_1 1_{Q-p} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathrm{MAT}(R^\star).$$

This implies that

$$\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R^\star[z_1](\kappa_i) = \mathrm{Im}^{R^\star[z_1]}(V_2^{-1}U) \oplus \left(\left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{p} R^\star[z_1](\kappa_i) \right) \dot{\oplus} \left(\bigoplus_{i=p+1}^{Q} R^\star(\kappa_i) \right) \right)$$

by [3, Lemma 1.1], where $R^\star[z_1] = k[z_1, x_{\rho+1}, \dots, x_r]$. Multiplying both sides of the above equality by V_2 on the left, we get

$$\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R^\star[z_1](\kappa_i) = \mathrm{Im}^{R^\star[z_1]}(U) \oplus \left(\left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{p} R^\star[z_1](\kappa_i) \right) \dot{\oplus} \left(\bigoplus_{i=p+1}^{Q} R^\star(\kappa_i) \right) \right).$$

Moreover, since an element of $[R^\star[z_1](\kappa_i)]_{-\kappa_p}$ is zero or lies in k for all $1 \le i \le p$, we see

$$\begin{aligned} \left[\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R^\star[z_1](\kappa_i) \right]_{-\kappa_p} &= \left[\mathrm{Im}^{R^\star[z_1]}(U) \right]_{-\kappa_p} \oplus \left[\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R^\star(\kappa_i) \right]_{-\kappa_p} \\ &= \langle b_1, \dots, b_m,\ H \rangle \oplus \left[\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R^\star(\kappa_i) \right]_{-\kappa_p}, \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where $\langle b_1, \dots, b_m,\ H \rangle$ denotes the vector space over k spanned by $b_1, \dots, b_m$ and the columns of H. Note that $\langle b_1, \dots, b_m,\ H \rangle = \langle H \rangle$ when $\kappa_{p+1} > \kappa_p + 1$.

We will denote a matrix Z with components in R by $Z(x_1, \dots, x_r)$ when we want to pay attention to the variables $x_1, \dots, x_r$. Let ξ_j $(\rho + 1 \leq j \leq r)$ be parameters over R. For a matrix $Z = Z(x_1, \dots, x_r)$ with components in R, let

$$\tilde{Z} = \tilde{Z}(\xi_{\rho+1}, \dots, \xi_r, x_1, \dots, x_r) := Z(x_1, \dots, x_\rho, x_{\rho+1} + \xi_{\rho+1} z_1, \dots, x_r + \xi_r z_1)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{Z} = \bar{Z}(\xi_{\rho+1}, \dots, \xi_r, x_1, \dots, x_\rho) &:= Z(x_1, \dots, x_\rho, \xi_{\rho+1} z_1, \dots, \xi_r z_1) \\ &= \tilde{Z}(\xi_{\rho+1}, \dots, \xi_r, x_1, \dots, x_\rho, 0, \dots, 0). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$\bar{Z}(x_{\rho+1}/z_1, \dots, x_r/z_1, x_1, \dots, x_\rho) = Z(x_1, \dots, x_r). \tag{4}$$

Now we consider $b_1, \dots, b_m$ and H. Notice that their components are polynomials in $z_1, x_{\rho+1}, \dots, x_r$. With the notation above, the components of $\tilde{b}_1, \dots, \tilde{b}_m$ and $\tilde{H}$, therefore, lie in $k[z_1, x_{\rho+1}, \dots, x_r, \xi_{\rho+1}, \dots, \xi_r] = R^\star[z_1] \otimes_k k[\xi_{\rho+1}, \dots, \xi_r]$. Let T be the local ring $k[\xi_{\rho+1}, \dots, \xi_r]_{(\xi_{\rho+1}, \dots, \xi_r)}$ and let $\langle \tilde{b}_1, \dots, \tilde{b}_m,\ \tilde{H} \rangle_T$ denote the submodule of

$$\left[\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R^\star[z_1](\kappa_i) \otimes_k T \right]_{-\kappa_p}$$

spanned over T by $\tilde{b}_1, \dots, \tilde{b}_m$ and the columns of $\tilde{H}$, where $[S \otimes_k T]_j = [S]_j \otimes_k T$ for $j \in \mathbf{Z}$. Note that $\langle \tilde{b}_1, \dots, \tilde{b}_m,\ \tilde{H} \rangle_T = \langle \tilde{H} \rangle_T$ in the case $\kappa_{p+1} > \kappa_p + 1$. Since $\tilde{b}_i(0, \dots, 0, x_1, \dots, x_r) = b_i$ $(1 \leq i \leq m)$ and $\tilde{H}(0, \dots, 0, x_1, \dots, x_r) = H$, we find by (3) that

$$\left[\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R^\star[z_1](\kappa_i) \otimes_k T \right]_{-\kappa_p} = \langle \tilde{b}_1, \dots, \tilde{b}_m,\ \tilde{H} \rangle_T \oplus \left[\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R^\star(\kappa_i) \otimes_k T \right]_{-\kappa_p}. \tag{5}$$

Put

$$N_p := 0^p \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{i=p+1}^{Q} R^\star(\kappa_i) \right) \subset \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R^\star(\kappa_i) \right).$$

This is a module over $R^\star$ consisting of all the elements of $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R^\star(\kappa_i) \subset \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R(\kappa_i) = S$ such that the first p components are zero. Let v be an element of $\left[N_p\right]_{-\kappa_p}$. Note that no variables $x_1, \dots, x_\rho$ appear in v although we write $v = v(x_1, \dots, x_r)$. We have

$$\tilde{v}(\xi_{\rho+1}, \dots, \xi_r, x_1, \dots, x_r)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{m} \tilde{b}_i(\xi_{\rho+1}, \ldots, \xi_r, x_1, \ldots, x_r)\hat{g}_i + \tilde{H}(\xi_{\rho+1}, \ldots, \xi_r, x_1, \ldots, x_r) \cdot {}^t(\hat{f}_1, \ldots, \hat{f}_l) + w \tag{6}$$

with $\hat{g}_i,\ \hat{f}_i \in T$ and $w \in \left[\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R^\star(\kappa_i) \otimes_k T\right]_{-\kappa_p}$ by (5), where l denotes the number of the columns of H.

Lemma 1.1. *Let v and w be as above. Suppose that $w \equiv 0 \pmod{(x_{\rho+1}, \ldots, x_r)}$. Then*

$$z_1^\nu v \in \operatorname{Im}^{R^\star[z_1]}(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \oplus N_p$$

for all $\nu \geq 0$.

Proof. Since $v \in [N_p]_{-\kappa_p}$ by hypotheses, the first p components of $\tilde{v}$ are zero. Besides, since an element of $[R^\star[z_1](\kappa_i) \otimes_k T]_{-\kappa_p}$ is zero or lies in T for $1 \leq i \leq p$, it follows from the assumption $w \equiv 0 \pmod{(x_{\rho+1}, \ldots, x_r)}$ that the first p components of w are also zero. On the other hand, the vectors $\tilde{b}_i''$ $(1 \leq i \leq m)$ are linearly independent over T and the first p components of the columns of $\tilde{H}$ are zero, since these properties are inherited from $b_1'', \ldots, b_m''$ and H. Hence, $\hat{g}_i = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$. In other words

$$\tilde{v}(\xi_{\rho+1}, \ldots, \xi_r, x_1, \ldots, x_r) = \tilde{H}(\xi_{\rho+1}, \ldots, \xi_r, x_1, \ldots, x_r) \cdot {}^t(\hat{f}_1, \ldots, \hat{f}_l) + w,$$

so that

$$\bar{v}(\xi_{\rho+1}, \ldots, \xi_r, x_1, \ldots, x_\rho) = \bar{H}(\xi_{\rho+1}, \ldots, \xi_r, x_1, \ldots, x_\rho) \cdot {}^t(\hat{f}_1, \ldots, \hat{f}_l).$$

Let $\nu \geq 0$ be an integer. Since the denominators of $\hat{f}_i$ $(1 \leq i \leq l)$ lies in $k^* + (\xi_{\rho+1}, \ldots, \xi_r)$, there is a polynomial $\psi_0 \in (\xi_{\rho+1}, \ldots, \xi_r)^{\nu+1}$ such that $\psi_i := (1 + \psi_0)\hat{f}_i \in k[\xi_{\rho+1}, \ldots, \xi_r]$ for all $1 \leq i \leq l$. Hence

$$(1 + \psi_0) z_1^\nu \bar{v}(\xi_{\rho+1}, \ldots, \xi_r, x_1, \ldots, x_\rho) = z_1^\nu \bar{H}(\xi_{\rho+1}, \ldots, \xi_r, x_1, \ldots, x_\rho) \cdot {}^t(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_l).$$

Now substitute x_j/z_1 for ξ_j for all $\rho + 1 \leq j \leq r$ in this equality. We find by (4) that

$$\begin{aligned}(1 + \psi_0(x_{\rho+1}/z_1, \ldots, x_r/z_1)) z_1^\nu v(x_{\rho+1}, \ldots, x_r) \\ = z_1^\nu H(x_1, \ldots, x_r) \cdot {}^t(\psi_1(x_{\rho+1}/z_1, \ldots, x_r/z_1), \ldots, \psi_l(x_{\rho+1}/z_1, \ldots, x_r/z_1)).\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Write

$$\psi_j(x_{\rho+1}/z_1, \ldots, x_r/z_1) = \sum_{\mu \geq 0} \psi_{j\mu}(x_{\rho+1}, \ldots, x_r)/z_1^\mu$$

for $0 \leq j \leq l$, where $\psi_{j\mu}(x_{\rho+1}, \ldots, x_r)$ is a homogeneous polynomial in $x_{\rho+1}, \ldots, x_r$ of degree μ for each j, μ. Notice that $\psi_{0\mu} = 0$ for $\mu \leq \nu$. Moreover, we can write $a_i = z_1 a_{i1} + a_{i0}$ by (2), where a_{i1} (resp. a_{i0}) is a column of U_1 (resp. U_0). Compare terms with no factor z_1 in the denominators in the above equality (7). Then, since $v \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R^\star(\kappa_i)$ and each column of H is of the form $z_1^{\nu_1} x_{\rho+1}^{\nu_{\rho+1}}, \ldots, x_r^{\nu_r} a_i$, we find that $z_1^\nu v$ is the sum of a finite number of vectors of the forms

$$z_1^{\nu_1+\nu-\mu} x_{\rho+1}^{\nu_{\rho+1}}, \ldots, x_r^{\nu_r} \psi_{j\mu}(x_{\rho+1}, \ldots, x_r) a_i$$

$$(\deg(a_i) + \nu_1 + \sum_{t=\rho+1}^{r} \nu_t = -\kappa_p,\ \nu_t \geq 0\ (t = 1, \rho+1, \ldots, r),$$

$$\nu_1 + \nu \geq \mu,\ 1 \leq i \leq n,\ 1 \leq j \leq l) \quad \text{and}$$

$$x_{\rho+1}^{\nu_{\rho+1}}, \ldots, x_r^{\nu_r} \psi_{j\nu_1+\nu+1}(x_{\rho+1}, \ldots, x_r) a_{i1}$$

$$(\deg(a_i) + \nu_1 + \sum_{t=\rho+1}^{r} \nu_t = -\kappa_p,\ \nu_t \geq 0\ (t = 1, \rho+1, \ldots, r),$$

$$1 \leq i \leq n,\ 1 \leq j \leq l).$$

Since the first p components of a_{i1} are zero for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, our assertion holds. □

Lemma 1.2. *Assumption being the same as in Lemma 1.1, we have*

$$W^\nu v \in N_p$$

for all $\nu \geq 0$.

Proof. For $\nu = 0$, our assertion is trivial. Suppose $\nu > 0$. Using the equality $\Omega = z_1 1_Q - W$, we see

$$z_1^\nu v = \Omega \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} z_1^{\nu-i} W^{i-1} \right) v + W^\nu v.$$

On the other hand, $z_1^\nu v = \omega_1 + \omega_2$ with $\omega_1 \in \mathrm{Im}^{R^\star[z_1]}(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \subset \mathrm{Im}^{R^\star[z_1]}(\Omega)$, $\omega_2 \in N_p$ by Lemma 1.1. The vector $\omega_2 - W^\nu v$ is therefore contained in $\mathrm{Im}^{R^\star[z_1]}(\Omega)$. Since the components of $\omega_2 - W^\nu v$ are all contained in $R^\star$ and Ω is a square matrix such that $\Omega = z_1 1_Q - W$ with $W \in \mathrm{MAT}(R^\star)$, it follows that $\omega_2 - W^\nu v = 0$. Hence $W^\nu v \in N_p$. □

Remark 1.3. When $\kappa_{p+1} > \kappa_p + 1$, the j-th column of W lies in N_p for all j with $p + 1 \leq j \leq Q$. Hence $W^\nu N_p \subset N_p$ for all $\nu \geq 0$.

Lemma 1.4. *With the notation above,*

$$S = \bigoplus_{j=1}^{\rho} \mathrm{Im}^{k[x_j,\ldots,x_r]}(\Theta_j) \oplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R^\star(\kappa_i).$$

Proof. By the same argument as that of the proof of [3, Lemma 1.1],

$$\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[x_j,\dots,x_r](\kappa_i) = \operatorname{Im}^{k[x_j,\dots,x_r]}(\varTheta_j) \oplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[x_{j+1},\dots,x_r](\kappa_i)$$

for all $1 \leq j \leq \rho$. Our assertion follows by repeated use of this formula. $\square$

Lemma 1.5. *Let* κ_i $(1 \leq i \leq Q)$, $\varTheta_j$ $(1 \leq j \leq \rho)$, p, q, N_p, ξ_j $(\rho+1 \leq j \leq r)$, S *and* T *be as above. Let* $v_1,\dots,v_\delta$ *be homogeneous elements of* $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R^\star(\kappa_i)$ *and* v *an element of* $[N_p]_{-\kappa_p} \cap \operatorname{Im}^{R^\star}(v_1,\dots,v_\delta)$. *Suppose that the number of the homogeneous minimal generators of*

$$S/\operatorname{Im}^{R}(\varTheta_1,\dots,\varTheta_\rho,v_1,\dots,v_\delta)$$

over $R^\star$ *of degree* $-\kappa_p$ *is* $q' := \max\{\ i \mid \kappa_{p-i+1} = \cdots = \kappa_{p-1} = \kappa_p\ \}$ *and remains unchanged for any small homogeneous transformation of variables* $x_1,\dots,x_r$. *Then, for every sequence* $s_2,\dots,s_\rho \in k$, *the element* w *of*

$$\left[\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R^\star(\kappa_i) \otimes_k T\right]_{-\kappa_p}$$

defined by the equality (6) *must be congruent to zero modulo* $(x_{\rho+1},\dots,x_r)$.

Proof. Let $s_2,\dots,s_\rho \in k$, and let z_1, $\varOmega$, U, b_i $(1 \leq i \leq m)$, and H be as above. We want to consider the $R \otimes_k k[\xi_{\rho+1},\dots,\xi_r]$-module $\operatorname{Coker}^{R\otimes_k k[\xi_{\rho+1},\dots,\xi_r]}(\tilde{\varTheta}_1,\dots,\tilde{\varTheta}_\rho,\tilde{v}_1,\dots,\tilde{v}_\delta)$ as a module over $R^\star \otimes_k k[\xi_{\rho+1},\dots,\xi_r]$, where $\tilde{\varTheta}_i = \tilde{\varTheta}_i(\xi_{\rho+1},\dots,\xi_r,x_1,\dots,x_r)$ $(1 \leq i \leq \rho)$ and $\tilde{v}_j = \tilde{v}_j(\xi_{\rho+1},\dots,\xi_r,x_1,\dots,x_r)$ $(1 \leq j \leq \delta)$. We see

$$S = \operatorname{Im}^{R}(\varTheta_1,\dots,\varTheta_\rho) + \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R^\star(\kappa_i)$$

by Lemma 1.4, so that

$$S \otimes_k T = \operatorname{Im}^{R\otimes_k T}(\tilde{\varTheta}_1,\dots,\tilde{\varTheta}_\rho) + \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R^\star(\kappa_i) \otimes_k T.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
&(S \otimes_k k[\xi_{\rho+1},\dots,\xi_r]_\psi)\,/\operatorname{Im}^{R\otimes_k k[\xi_{\rho+1},\dots,\xi_r]_\psi}(\tilde{\varTheta}_1,\dots,\tilde{\varTheta}_\rho,\tilde{v}_1,\dots,\tilde{v}_\delta)\\
&\qquad\cong \frac{\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R^\star(\kappa_i) \otimes_k k[\xi_{\rho+1},\dots,\xi_r]_\psi}{(R^\star \otimes_k k[\xi_{\rho+1},\dots,\xi_r]_\psi)E'}
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

over $R^\star \otimes_k k[\xi_{\rho+1}, \dots, \xi_r]_\psi$ for some $\psi \in k[\xi_{\rho+1}, \dots, \xi_r] \backslash (\xi_{\rho+1}, \dots, \xi_r)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} E' := {} & \operatorname{Im}^{R \otimes_k k[\xi_{\rho+1}, \dots, \xi_r]}(\tilde{\Theta}_{\rho+1}, \dots, \tilde{\Theta}_r, \tilde{v}_1, \dots, \tilde{v}_\delta) \\ & \cap \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R^\star(\kappa_i) \otimes_k k[\xi_{\rho+1}, \dots, \xi_r] \right). \end{aligned}$$

Let $e_i := {}^t(0, \dots, 0, \overset{\overset{i}{\smile}}{1}, 0, \dots, 0)$ $(1 \le i \le Q)$ denote the canonical bases of $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R^\star(\kappa_i) \otimes_k k[\xi_{\rho+1}, \dots, \xi_r]$. Then $\deg(e_i) = -\kappa_p$ if and only if $p - q' + 1 \le i \le p$. Since the parameters $\xi_{\rho+1}, \dots, \xi_r$ correspond to a small homogeneous transformation of the variables $x_1, \dots, x_r$, our hypothesis implies by (8) that the q' vectors $e_{p-q'+1}, \dots, e_p$ must be linearly independent over $k(\mathfrak{p})$ when considered in

$$\left(\frac{\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R^\star(\kappa_i) \otimes_k k[\xi_{\rho+1}, \dots, \xi_r]_\psi}{(R^\star \otimes_k k[\xi_{\rho+1}, \dots, \xi_r]_\psi) E'} \right) \otimes k(\mathfrak{p})$$

for all points $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec}(k[\xi_{\rho+1}, \dots, \xi_r])$ in a neighborhood of the origin $\xi_{\rho+1} = \cdots = \xi_r = 0$. We find therefore that the first p components of any element of E' of degree $-\kappa_p$ must be zero. Let w be the element of $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R^\star(\kappa_i) \otimes_k T$ of degree $-\kappa_p$ such that the equality (6) holds. The vectors $\tilde{b}_i$ $(1 \le i \le m)$ and the columns of $\tilde{H}$ are contained in $\operatorname{Im}^{R \otimes_k T}(\tilde{\Theta}_1, \dots, \tilde{\Theta}_\rho)$, and $\tilde{v} \in \operatorname{Im}^{R \otimes_k T}(\tilde{v}_1, \dots, \tilde{v}_\delta)$, so that $w \in (R^\star \otimes_k T)E'$. Hence $w \equiv 0 \pmod{(x_{\rho+1}, \dots, x_r)}$. □

§2. Matrices that represent operations of $x_1, \dots, x_\rho$

Let E be a finitely generated graded module over R. Suppose that there is an integer ρ satisfying $1 \le \rho < r$ such that E has a minimal free resolution of the form

$$\longrightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q'} R^\star(-\kappa'_i) \xrightarrow{\Phi} \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R^\star(\kappa_i) \xrightarrow{\pi} E \longrightarrow 0 \tag{9}$$

over $R^\star = k[x_{\rho+1}, \dots, x_r]$ with homogeneous homomorphisms Φ and π. We assume here that the sequences $\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_Q$ and $\kappa'_1, \dots, \kappa'_{Q'}$ are nondecreasing. Since E is a module over R, for each $1 \le j \le \rho$, there is a matrix X_j with components in $R^\star$ giving a homogeneous linear map

$$X_j : \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R^\star(\kappa_i - 1) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R^\star(\kappa_i)$$

of degree zero which represents the linear map

$$\times x_j : E(-1) \longrightarrow E$$

over $R^\star$.

Put $\Theta_j := x_j 1_Q - X_j$ $(1 \leq j \leq \rho)$. Then each matrix Θ_j gives a homogenous homomorphism

$$\Theta_j : \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R(\kappa_i - 1) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R(\kappa_i)$$

of degree zero. In what follows, for the sake of simplicity, let S and L denote the graded modules $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R(\kappa_i)$ and $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R^\star(\kappa_i)$ respectively, and e_i the canonical base ${}^t(0,\dots,0,\overset{\overset{i}{\smile}}{1},0,\dots,0)$ of $L \subset S$ for $1 \leq i \leq Q$. We define a homogeneous linear map $\pi^R : S \longrightarrow E$ over R of degree zero by setting $\pi^R(e_i) = \pi(e_i)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq Q$. Notice that $\pi^R(x_j v) = x_j \pi^R(v) = x_j \pi(v) = \pi(X_j v) = \pi^R(X_j v)$ for all $v \in L$ and $1 \leq j \leq \rho$.

As in the previous section, suppose there are positive integers p, q with $1 \leq p < Q$, $1 \leq q \leq Q - p$ satisfying $\kappa_p < \kappa_{p+1}$ and $q = \max\{\, i \mid \kappa_{p+1} = \cdots = \kappa_{p+i},\ p+i \leq Q \,\}$. Let s_j $(2 \leq j \leq \rho)$ be arbitrary elements of k, and define z_1, W, Ω and N_p in the same way as before. Further we put

$$[E]_{\leq \tilde{\kappa}} := \sum_{d \leq \tilde{\kappa}} [E]_d \subset E$$

for a graded module E and $\tilde{\kappa} \in \mathbf{Z}$.

Theorem 2.1. *With the notation above, suppose that Γ is chosen sufficiently generally. Then, $W^\nu \left[\mathrm{Im}(\Phi)\right]_{\leq -\kappa_p} \subset N_p$ for all $\nu \geq 0$.*

Proof. Since each column of Θ_j lies in $\mathrm{Ker}(\pi^R)$ for every $1 \leq j \leq \rho$, one sees that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\rho} \mathrm{Im}^{k[x_j,\dots,x_r]}(\Theta_j) \subset \sum_{j=1}^{\rho} \mathrm{Im}^R(\Theta_j) \subset \mathrm{Ker}(\pi^R).$$

By Lemma 1.4, therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Ker}(\pi^R) &= \sum_{j=1}^{\rho} \mathrm{Im}^{k[x_j,\dots,x_r]}(\Theta_j) + \mathrm{Ker}(\pi^R) \cap L = \sum_{j=1}^{\rho} \mathrm{Im}^{k[x_j,\dots,x_r]}(\Theta_j) + \mathrm{Ker}(\pi) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\rho} \mathrm{Im}^R(\Theta_j) + \mathrm{Im}(\Phi) = \sum_{j=1}^{\rho} \mathrm{Im}^R(\Theta_j) + \mathrm{Im}^R(\Phi).\end{aligned}$$

Let φ_i denote the i-th column of Φ for $1 \leq i \leq Q'$. Then

$$E = S / \mathrm{Im}^R(\Theta_1, \dots, \Theta_\rho, \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_{Q'})$$

by what we have seen. Now suppose that $\mathit{\Gamma}$ is chosen sufficiently generally. The non-decreasing sequences $\kappa_1, \ldots, \kappa_Q$ and $\kappa'_1, \ldots, \kappa'_{Q'}$ appearing in (9) do not change under any small homogeneous transformation of the variables $x_1, \ldots, x_r$. Let v be an arbitrary element of $[\mathrm{Im}(\mathit{\Phi})]_d$ for some $d \leq -\kappa_p$. Since the resolution (9) is minimal over $R^\star$, no element of k^* occurs in $\mathit{\Phi}$. This means that $x_r^{-\kappa_p - d} v \in [N_p]_{-\kappa_p} \cap \mathrm{Im}^{R^\star}(\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_{Q'})$. Hence $x_r^{-\kappa_p-d} W^\nu v = W^\nu x_r^{-\kappa_p-d} v \subset N_p$ for all $\nu \geq 0$ by Lemmas 1.2 and 1.5. Thus $W^\nu v \subset N_p$ for all $\nu \geq 0$. This proves our assertion. □

For each $1 \leq j \leq \rho$, one sees that $X_j \, \mathrm{Im}(\mathit{\Phi}) \subset \mathrm{Im}(\mathit{\Phi})$, since $\pi(X_j \, \mathrm{Im}(\mathit{\Phi})) = x_j \pi(\mathrm{Im}(\mathit{\Phi})) = 0$. Namely, $\mathrm{Im}(\mathit{\Phi})$ is a submodule of L over the $R^\star$ algebra $R^\star[X_1, \ldots, X_\rho]$. Varying $s_2, \ldots, s_\rho$, one can find something about $R^\star[X_1, \ldots, X_\rho]v$ for $v \in L$. But, it should be done carefully since $R^\star[X_1, \ldots, X_\rho]$ is not commutative in general. In the following argument, we consider the columns of $[X_i, X_j] = X_i X_j - X_j X_i$ as elements of L. Let θ_{ijl} denote the l-th column of $[X_i, X_j]$.

Lemma 2.2. *Let the notation be as above.*

1. *For every* $1 \leq l \leq Q$*, we have* $\theta_{ijl} \in \mathrm{Im}(\mathit{\Phi})$*.*
2. *The degree of* θ_{ijl} *is* $-\kappa_l + 2$ *for each* $1 \leq l \leq Q$*.*
3. $[X_i, X_j] N_p \subset R^\star \, [\mathrm{Im}(\mathit{\Phi})]_{\leq -\kappa_p} + \mathrm{Im}^{R^\star}(\theta_{ijp+1}, \ldots, \theta_{ijp+q})$*.*

Proof. Left to the readers. □

Theorem 2.3. *With the notation above, suppose that* $\mathit{\Gamma}$ *is chosen sufficiently generally. Suppose further that* $\mathrm{char}(k) = 0$ *and that* $\theta_{ijp+1}, \ldots, \theta_{ijp+q}$ *are contained in the submodule* $R^\star[X_1, \ldots, X_\rho] \, [\mathrm{Im}(\mathit{\Phi})]_{\leq -\kappa_p}$ *for all* i, j *with* $1 \leq i < j \leq \rho$*. Then we have* $R^\star[X_1, \ldots, X_\rho] \, [\mathrm{Im}(\mathit{\Phi})]_{\leq -\kappa_p} \subset N_p$*.*

Proof. We can write

$$W^\nu = \sum_{\substack{\nu_1 + \cdots + \nu_\rho = \nu, \\ \nu_i \geq 0 \ (1 \leq i \leq \rho)}} s_2^{\nu_2} \cdots s_\rho^{\nu_\rho} \vartheta_{\nu_1 \nu_2 \ldots \nu_\rho},$$

where $\vartheta_{\nu_1 \nu_2 \ldots \nu_\rho}$ is the sum of monomials of the form $X_{i_1} X_{i_2} \cdots X_{i_\nu}$ with $\#\{ \, l \mid i_l = j \, \} = \nu_j$ for all $1 \leq j \leq \rho$. Since $s_2, \ldots, s_\rho$ can be chosen arbitrarily, one sees by Lemma 2.1 that

$$\vartheta_{\nu_1 \nu_2 \ldots \nu_\rho} \, [\mathrm{Im}(\mathit{\Phi})]_{\leq -\kappa_p} \subset N_p. \tag{10}$$

To prove our assertion, it is enough to show that

$$X_{i_1} X_{i_2} \cdots X_{i_\nu} \, [\mathrm{Im}(\mathit{\Phi})]_{\leq -\kappa_p} \subset N_p \tag{11}$$

for all sequences $i_1, \ldots, i_\nu \in \{1, \ldots, \rho\}$ $(\nu \geq 0)$. The cases $\nu = 0, 1$ follow directly from Theorem 2.1. Before proceeding further, notice that

$$[X_i, X_j]N_p \subset R^\star \left[\mathrm{Im}(\Phi)\right]_{\leq -\kappa_p} + \sum_{i=1}^{\rho} X_i \left[\mathrm{Im}(\Phi)\right]_{\leq -\kappa_p} \tag{12}$$

by Lemma 2.2 and our hypothesis. Since $[\mathrm{Im}(\Phi)]_{\leq -\kappa_p} \subset N_p$ and $2X_iX_j = X_iX_j + X_jX_i + [X_i, X_j]$, the case $\nu = 2$ follows from (10), (12) and the case $\nu = 1$. For $\nu > 2$ and for each monomial $X_{i_1}X_{i_2}\cdots X_{i_\nu}$ with $\#\{\ l \mid i_l = j\ \} = \nu_j$ for every $1 \leq j \leq \rho$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\nu!}{\nu_1!\nu_2!\cdots\nu_\rho!} X_{i_1}X_{i_2}\cdots X_{i_\nu} \\ &\in \vartheta_{\nu_1\nu_2\ldots\nu_\rho} + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i < j \leq \rho,\ \mu \leq \nu-2, \\ 1 \leq j_l \leq \rho\ (1 \leq l \leq \nu-2)}} R^\star X_{j_1}X_{j_2}\cdots X_{j_\mu}[X_i, X_j]X_{j_{\mu+1}}X_{j_{\mu+2}}\cdots X_{j_{\nu-2}}, \end{aligned}$$

making repeated use of $X_{i'}X_{j'} = X_{j'}X_{i'} + [X_{i'}, X_{j'}]$. Assuming that (11) is true for all smaller values of ν, we see

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\nu!}{\nu_1!\nu_2!\cdots\nu_\rho!} X_{i_1}X_{i_2}\cdots X_{i_\nu}v \\ &\in \vartheta_{\nu_1\nu_2\ldots\nu_\rho}v + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i < j \leq \rho,\ \mu \leq \nu-2, \\ 1 \leq j_l \leq \rho\ (1 \leq l \leq \mu)}} R^\star X_{j_1}X_{j_2}\cdots X_{j_\mu}[X_i, X_j]N_p. \end{aligned}$$

for all $v \in [\mathrm{Im}(\Phi)]_{\leq -\kappa_p}$. This, together with (12), leads us to our assertion by induction on ν. ☐

Corollary 2.4. *Let the notation be as above and suppose that Γ is chosen sufficiently generally. If* $\mathrm{char}(k) = 0$ *and* $[\mathrm{Im}(\Phi)]_{-\kappa_{p+1}+2} \subset R^\star[X_1, \ldots, X_\rho]\,[\mathrm{Im}(\Phi)]_{\leq -\kappa_p}$, *then* $R^\star[X_1, \ldots, X_\rho]\,[\mathrm{Im}(\Phi)]_{\leq -\kappa_p} \subset N_p$.

Proof. One has $\theta_{ijp+1}, \ldots, \theta_{ijp+q} \in [\mathrm{Im}(\Phi)]_{-\kappa_{p+1}+2}$ by (2) of Lemma 2.2. ☐

Proposition 2.5. *With the notation above, assume that $\rho = r - 1$. Suppose that $0 :_E x_r$ is generated over R by $[0 :_E x_r]_{\leq \tilde{\kappa}-1}$ for an integer $\tilde{\kappa}$. Then the following assertions hold.*

(1) $\mathrm{Im}(\Phi)$ *is generated over* $R^\star[X_1, \ldots, X_\rho]$ *by* $[\mathrm{Im}(\Phi)]_{\leq \tilde{\kappa}}$.

(2) *Suppose further that Γ is chosen sufficiently generally, that* $\mathrm{char}(k) = 0$, *and that $\tilde{\kappa} + \kappa_1 \leq 0$. Let p be the largest among the integers i satisfying $\tilde{\kappa} + \kappa_i \leq 0$, $1 \leq i \leq Q$. Then* $\mathrm{Im}(\Phi) \subset N_p$ *and* $l_R(E) = \infty$.

(3) *(Corollary 3.11 (Socle Lemma) (ii) of [8]) If* $\mathrm{char}(k) = 0$, $l_R(E) < \infty$ *and Γ is sufficiently general, we have* $\tilde{\kappa} > \max\{\ d \mid [E/x_rE]_d \neq 0\ \}$.

Proof. Put $\bar{R}^\star := R^\star/x_rR^\star$. When $\rho = r-1$, the components of $\varPhi$ lie in $x_rR^\star$. Besides, $\pi(v/x_r) \in 0 :_E x_r$ for all $v \in \operatorname{Im}(\varPhi)$. Let ϕ denote the map from $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q'} \bar{R}^\star(-\kappa'_i+1) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q'} k(-\kappa'_i+1)$ to $0 :_E x_r$ defined by $\phi(\bar{w}) := \pi(\varPhi(w)/x_r)$ for $\bar{w} \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q'} k(-\kappa'_i+1)$, where $w \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q'} \bar{R}^\star(-\kappa'_i+1)$ and $\bar{w} = w \pmod{(x_r)}$. It can be verified without difficulty that ϕ is a homogeneous isomorphism of degree zero over k.

(1) It follows from the hypothesis that

$$\operatorname{Im}^{R^\star}(\varPhi/x_r) \subset R^\star[X_1,\dots,X_\rho]\left[\operatorname{Im}^{R^\star}(\varPhi/x_r)\right]_{\le\tilde{\kappa}-1} + \operatorname{Im}(\varPhi),$$

in other words,

$$\operatorname{Im}(\varPhi) \subset R^\star[X_1,\dots,X_\rho]\,[\operatorname{Im}(\varPhi)]_{\le\tilde{\kappa}} + x_r\operatorname{Im}(\varPhi).$$

Hence $\operatorname{Im}(\varPhi) = R^\star[X_1,\dots,X_\rho]\,[\operatorname{Im}(\varPhi)]_{\le\tilde{\kappa}}$.

(2) When $p = Q$, we have $[\operatorname{Im}(\varPhi)]_{\le\tilde{\kappa}} = 0$, so that $\operatorname{Im}(\varPhi) = 0 = N_Q$ by (1). Next consider the case $1 \le p < Q$. Since $\tilde{\kappa} \le -\kappa_p$ by hypothesis and (1) holds, $\operatorname{Im}(\varPhi)$ satisfies the required conditions for the assertion of Corollary 2.4 to be true. Hence

$$\operatorname{Im}(\varPhi) \subset R^\star[X_1,\dots,X_\rho]\,[\operatorname{Im}(\varPhi)]_{\le -\kappa_p} \subset N_p.$$

In consequence, the map π restricted to $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{p} R^\star(\kappa_i)$ is an injective homomorphism into E, which implies that $l_R(E) = \infty$.

(3) Notice that $-\kappa_1 = \max\{\ d \mid [E/x_rE]_d \ne 0\ \}$. Our assertion follows from the previous one. ☐

§3. Pseudo Weierstrass basis

Throughout this section we work over a finitely generated graded module E over R. For a subset E'' of E, let $(x_j,\dots,x_r)E'$ denote the set $x_jE' + \cdots + x_rE'$ for $1 \le j \le r$ and $(x_j,\dots,x_r)E' := \{0\}$ for $j = r+1$.

Definition 3.1. Let $P = \{\ e^i_l \mid 1 \le i \le r+1,\ 1 \le l \le m_i\ \}$ be a set of homogeneous generators of E,

$$E^{\langle i\rangle} := \sum_{l=1}^{m_i} k[x_i,\dots,x_r]e^i_l \quad \text{for all} \quad 1 \le i \le r+1, \quad \text{and} \tag{13}$$

$$E^{[j]} := \sum_{i=j}^{r+1} E^{\langle i\rangle} \quad \text{for all} \quad 1 \le j \le r+1, \tag{14}$$

where $k[x_i,\dots,x_r] = k$ for $i = r+1$ and $\sum_{l=1}^{m_i}(\quad) = 0$ if $m_i = 0$. We call P a *pseudo Weierstrass basis* of E with respect to $x_1,\dots,x_r$, when it satisfies the following conditions.

(i) The module $k[x_i, \dots, x_r]e^i_l$ is free over $k[x_i, \dots, x_r]$ for each pair i, l.

(ii) The sum (13) is direct over $k[x_i, \dots, x_r]$.

(iii) The sum (14) is direct over k.

(iv) $E = E^{[1]}$.

(v) For every triple i', j, l satisfying $1 \le i' < j \le r+1,\ 1 \le l \le m_j$, we have

$$x_{i'}e^j_l \in (x_j, \dots, x_r)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{j-1} E^{\langle i\rangle}\right) + E^{[j]}. \tag{15}$$

A Weierstrass basis of E with respect to $x_1, \dots, x_r$ defined in [3, Section 2] is automatically a pseudo Weierstrass basis of E with respect to $x_1, \dots, x_r$. In the above definition, the condition (v) is a loosened form of the corresponding condition appearing in the definition of Weierstrass basis.

Theorem 3.2. *Suppose that the linear forms $x_1, \dots, x_r$ form a reverse filter-regular E-sequence (see [3, Definition 2.1]). Then there is a pseudo Weierstrass basis of E with respect to $x_1, \dots, x_r$. In particular, there is a pseudo Weierstrass basis of E with respect to $x_1, \dots, x_r$ if $\varGamma$ is chosen sufficiently generally.*

Proof. See [3, Theorem 2.11]. ☐

Lemma 3.3. *Let $P = \{\ e^i_l \mid 1 \le i \le r+1,\ 1 \le l \le m_i\ \}$ be a pseudo Weierstrass basis of E with respect to $x_1, \dots, x_r$. Put $\tilde{E} := E/(H^0_{\mathfrak{m}}(E)+x_rE)$ and let $\tilde{e}^i_l := e^i_l \pmod{(H^0_{\mathfrak{m}}(E)+x_rE)}$. Then $\{\ \tilde{e}^i_l \mid 1 \le i \le r,\ 1 \le l \le m_i\ \}$ is a pseudo Weierstrass basis of the $R/(x_r)$-module $\tilde{E}$ with respect to $x_1, \dots, x_{r-1}$.*

Proof. Left to the readers. See [3, Lemma 2.4, (3)] in which the notation is a little bit different from the present one. ☐

Lemma 3.4. *Suppose that $\varGamma$ is sufficiently general and let $P = \{\ e^i_l \mid 1 \le i \le r+1,\ 1 \le l \le m_i\ \}$ be a pseudo Weierstrass basis of E with respect to $x_1, \dots, x_r$. Let further $(\bar{n}^1; \dots; \bar{n}^{r+1})$ be the basic sequence of E (see [3, Definition 2.13]). Then $\bar{n}^i = (\deg(e^i_1), \dots, \deg(e^i_{m_i}))$ up to permutation for all $1 \le i \le r+1$.*

Proof. By (v) of Definition 3.1, $E^{\langle r+1\rangle} = E^{[r+1]}$ is a module over R. One sees therefore that $E^{\langle r+1\rangle} \subset H^0_{\mathfrak{m}}(E) \subset \bigcup_{t>0} 0 :_E x^t_r \subset E^{\langle r+1\rangle}$, that is $E^{\langle r+1\rangle} = H^0_{\mathfrak{m}}(E)$. This also holds for a Weierstrass basis of E with respect to $x_1, \dots, x_r$ by [3, (1) of Lemma 2.4]. Since $\{\ e^{r+1}_1, \dots, e^{r+1}_{m_{r+1}}\ \}$ forms a basis of the vector space $H^0_{\mathfrak{m}}(E)$ over k, one finds that $\bar{n}^{r+1} = (\deg(e^{r+1}_1), \dots, \deg(e^{r+1}_{m_{r+1}}))$ up to permutation. Consider the module $\tilde{E} := E/(H^0_{\mathfrak{m}}(E) + x_rE)$ over $R/(x_r)$. Then $\{\ \tilde{e}^i_l \mid 1 \le i \le r,\ 1 \le l \le m_i\ \}$ is a pseudo

Weierstrass basis of $\tilde{E}$ with respect to $x_1, \ldots, x_{r-1}$ by Lemma 3.3 and $(\bar{n}^1; \ldots; \bar{n}^r)$ is the basic sequence of $\tilde{E}$ by Theorem 2.12 and Definition 2.13 of [3]. By induction we reach our assertion. ☐

Lemma 3.5. *Let* $P = \{\, e^i_l \mid 1 \le i \le r+1,\ 1 \le l \le m_i \,\}$ *be a pseudo Weierstrass basis of* E *with respect to* $x_1, \ldots, x_r$*. Then,*

$$RE^{[j+1]} \subset (x_{j+1}, \ldots, x_r)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{j} E^{\langle i\rangle}\right) + E^{[j+1]}. \tag{16}$$

for every $1 \le j \le r$*.*

Proof. Let us show our assertion by descending induction on j. We see by (v) of Definition 3.1 that $E^{[r+1]}$ is a submodule of E over R. This proves (16) for $j = r$. Suppose that $1 \le j < r$ and that

$$RE^{[j+2]} \subset (x_{j+2}, \ldots, x_r)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{j+1} E^{\langle i\rangle}\right) + E^{[j+2]}. \tag{17}$$

Since $E^{[j+1]} = E^{\langle j+1\rangle} + E^{[j+2]}$, we find by (15) and (17) that

$$\begin{aligned}(x_1, \ldots, x_r)E^{\langle j+1\rangle} &\subset (x_{j+1}, \ldots, x_r)E + k[x_{j+1}, \ldots, x_r]E^{[j+1]}\\ &\subset (x_{j+1}, \ldots, x_r)E + E^{\langle j+1\rangle} + RE^{[j+2]}\\ &\subset (x_{j+1}, \ldots, x_r)E + E^{[j+1]},\end{aligned}$$

so that

$$(x_1, \ldots, x_r)E^{[j+1]} \subset (x_{j+1}, \ldots, x_r)E + E^{[j+1]}$$

by (17). Repeated use of this inclusion yields

$$RE^{[j+1]} \subset (x_{j+1}, \ldots, x_r)E + E^{[j+1]}.$$

Since $E = E^{[1]}$, we see that (16) holds for j again by (17). ☐

Lemma 3.6. *Let* $P = \{\, e^i_l \mid 1 \le i \le r+1,\ 1 \le l \le m_i \,\}$ *be a pseudo Weierstrass basis of* E *with respect to* $x_1, \ldots, x_r$ *and* i_0, l_0 *be integers with* $1 \le i_0 \le r,\ 1 \le l_0 \le m_{i_0}$*. Let further* η *be a homogeneous element of* $RE^{[i_0+1]}$ *of degree* $\deg(e^{i_0}_{l_0})$*. For each pair of integers* i, l *with* $1 \le i \le r,\ 1 \le l \le m_i$*, put* $e'^i_l := e^{i_0}_{l_0} + \eta$ *if* $(i,l) = (i_0, l_0)$ *and* $e'^i_l := e^i_l$ *otherwise. Then* $P' := \{\, e'^i_l \mid 1 \le i \le r+1,\ 1 \le l \le m_i \,\}$ *is also a pseudo Weierstrass basis of* E *with respect to* $x_1, \ldots, x_r$*.*

Proof. Put

$$E^{\langle i\rangle\prime} := \sum_{l=1}^{m_i} k[x_i,\dots,x_r]e'^{i}_{l} \quad \text{for } 1 \le i \le r+1 \text{ and } \quad E^{[j]\prime} := \sum_{i=j}^{r+1} E^{\langle i\rangle\prime}.$$

Claim 1. $E^{[1]\prime} = E$.

Proof of Claim 1. This claim can be proved by induction on $r - i_0$. Consider first the case $i_0 = r$. Since $E^{[i_0+1]\prime} = E^{[r+1]} = H^0_{\mathfrak{m}}(E)$ is a module over R, $R\eta \in E^{[i_0+1]\prime}$. Hence $E = E^{[1]} \subset E^{[1]\prime} + R\eta \subset E^{[1]\prime} + E^{[i_0+1]\prime} = E^{[1]\prime} \subset E$. Now suppose that $r - i_0 > 0$ and that our assertion is true for all smaller values of $r - i_0$. Put $\tilde{E} := E/(H^0_{\mathfrak{m}}(E) + x_rE)$ and let $\tilde{\eta}$, $\tilde{e}^i_l$ and $\tilde{e}'^i_l$ denote the elements of $\tilde{E}$ obtained from η, e^i_l and e'^i_l respectively modulo $H^0_{\mathfrak{m}}(E) + x_rE$. Put further

$$\tilde{E}^{\langle i\rangle\prime} := \sum_{l=1}^{m_i} k[x_i,\dots,x_{r-1}]\tilde{e}'^{i}_{l} \quad \text{for } 1 \le i \le r \text{ and } \quad \tilde{E}^{[j]\prime} := \sum_{i=j}^{r} \tilde{E}^{\langle i\rangle\prime}.$$

Then the set $\{ \tilde{e}^i_l \mid 1 \le i \le r,\ 1 \le l \le m_i \}$ is a pseudo Weierstrass basis of the module $\tilde{E}$ over $R/(x_r)$ and $\tilde{\eta} \in (R/(x_r))\tilde{E}^{[i_0+1]\prime}$. Since $(r-1) - i_0 < r - i_0$, we have $\tilde{E} = \tilde{E}^{[1]\prime}$ by our induction hypothesis. In other words, $E = E^{[1]\prime} + x_rE$. Since $x_rE^{[1]\prime} \subset E^{[1]\prime}$, plugging the above equality into E on the right hand side successively, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} E &= E^{[1]\prime} + x_r(E^{[1]\prime} + x_rE) \\ &= E^{[1]\prime} + x_r^2E = E^{[1]\prime} + x_r^{\nu}E \end{aligned}$$

for all $\nu > 0$. Thus $E^{[1]\prime} = E$. ◊

Claim 2. For all $1 \le j \le r$, we have

$$RE^{[j+1]\prime} \subset (x_{j+1},\dots,x_r)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{j} E^{\langle i\rangle\prime}\right) + E^{[j+1]\prime}. \tag{18}$$

Proof of Claim 2. Let the notation be as in the proof of Claim 1. We again show our assertion by induction on $r - i_0$. In the case $r = i_0$, $E^{\langle i\rangle\prime} = E^{\langle i\rangle}$ and $E^{[i]\prime} = E^{[i]}$ for $1 \le i < r$, $E^{\langle r\rangle} \subset E^{\langle r\rangle\prime} + R\eta$, $E^{\langle r\rangle\prime} \subset E^{\langle r\rangle} + R\eta$, and $R\eta \in E^{[i_0+1]\prime} = E^{[r+1]} = H^0_{\mathfrak{m}}(E)$. It follows therefore that

$$\begin{aligned} RE^{[j+1]\prime} &\subset RE^{[j+1]} + R\eta \\ &\qquad \subset (x_{j+1},\dots,x_r)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{j} E^{\langle i\rangle}\right) + E^{[j+1]} + E^{[r+1]\prime} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\subset (x_{j+1},\dots,x_r)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{j} E^{\langle i\rangle\prime}\right)+E^{[j+1]\prime}+R\eta+E^{[r+1]\prime}\\ &\subset (x_{j+1},\dots,x_r)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{j} E^{\langle i\rangle\prime}\right)+E^{[j+1]\prime}\end{aligned}$$

for all $1 \le j \le r$. Suppose that $r - i_0 > 0$ and that (18) holds for all smaller values of $r - i_0$. Then, since $E = E^{[1]\prime}$ and

$$(R/(x_r))\tilde{E}^{[j+1]\prime} \subset (x_{j+1},\dots,x_{r-1})\left(\sum_{i=1}^{j} \tilde{E}^{\langle i\rangle\prime}\right)+\tilde{E}^{[j+1]\prime}$$

for all $1 \le j \le r-1$ by the induction hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned}RE^{[j+1]\prime} &\subset (x_{j+1},\dots,x_{r-1})\left(\sum_{i=1}^{j} E^{\langle i\rangle\prime}\right)+E^{[j+1]\prime}+H^0_{\mathfrak{m}}(E)+x_rE\\ &\subset (x_{j+1},\dots,x_r)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{j} E^{\langle i\rangle\prime}\right)+E^{[j+1]\prime}\end{aligned}$$

for all $1 \le j < r$. Besides, the inclusion (18) is clear for $j = r$. ◊

Claim 3. $\sum_{i=1}^{r+1}\sum_{l=1}^{m_i} g^i_l {e'}^i_l = 0$ with $g^i_l \in k[x_i,\dots,x_r]$ for all i, l if and only if $g^i_l = 0$ for all i, l.

Proof of Claim 3. By (i) – (iv) of Definition 3.1,

$$\dim_k([E]_\nu) = \sum_{i=1}^{r+1}\sum_{l=1}^{m_i}\dim_k([k[x_i,\dots,x_r]]_{\nu-\deg(e^i_l)}) \quad \text{for all} \quad \nu\in\mathbf{Z}.$$

On the other hand,

$$\dim_k(\left[E^{[1]\prime}\right]_\nu) \le \sum_{i=1}^{r+1}\sum_{l=1}^{m_i}\dim_k([k[x_i,\dots,x_r]]_{\nu-\deg({e'}^i_l)}) \quad \text{for all} \quad \nu\in\mathbf{Z}.$$

Moreover $\deg({e'}^i_l) = \deg(e^i_l)$ for all i, l by the definition of ${e'}^i_l$. If there were a nontrivial relation $\sum_{i=1}^{r+1}\sum_{l=1}^{m_i} g^i_l {e'}^i_l = 0$ with $g^i_l \in k[x_i,\dots,x_r]$ for all i, l, then $\dim_k(\left[E^{[1]\prime}\right]_\nu) < \dim_k([E]_\nu)$ for some $\nu \in \mathbf{Z}$. This contradicts Claim 1. Hence our assertion holds. ◊

The conditions (i) – (v) of Definition 3.1 are all satisfied by P' by Claims 1 – 3. □

§4. Gorenstein graded rings of dimension zero

In this section, we show how we can apply the results of section 2 to Gorenstein graded rings.

Let I be a homogeneous ideal in R such that the graded ring $A := R/I$ is of dimension zero and let $B_R(I) = (a; n_1^2, \dots, n_a^2; \cdots; n_1^r, \dots, n_{m_r}^r)$ be its basic sequence. Notice that $m_{r+1} = 0$ and $\bar{n}^{r+1} = \emptyset$ since $H^0_{\mathfrak{m}}(I) = 0$. Assume that $r \geq 3$ and that Γ is chosen sufficiently generally. Put $\rho := r-1$ and $R^\star := k[x_r]$. Let $P = \{\ f_l^i \mid 1 \leq i \leq r,\ 1 \leq l \leq m_i\ \}$ be a pseudo Weierstrass basis of I with respect to $x_1, \dots, x_r$, $I^{\langle i \rangle} := \bigoplus_{l=1}^{m_i} k[x_i, \dots, x_r] f_l^i$ $(1 \leq i \leq r)$ (see the previous section), and $I' := \sum_{i=1}^{\rho} I^{\langle i \rangle}$. Note that $I = \sum_{i=1}^{r} I^{\langle i \rangle} = I' + I^{\langle r \rangle}$ and that these sums are direct over $R^\star$. For the sake of convenience, we put $\bar{R} := R/(x_r) = k[x_1, \dots, x_{r-1}]$, $\mathfrak{n} := (x_1, \dots, x_{r-1}) \subset k[x_1, \dots, x_{r-1}]$, $\bar{R}^\star := R^\star/x_r R^\star$, $\bar{A} := A/x_r A$, $\bar{I} := I + (x_r)/(x_r) \subset \bar{R}$ and $\tilde{I} := I/x_r I$. For an element $f \in I$, put $\tilde{f} := f \pmod{x_r I} \in I/x_r I$ and $\bar{f} := f \pmod{(x_r)} \in \bar{I}$.

Lemma 4.1. *With the notation above, R/I' is a finitely generated graded free module over $R^\star$ of rank m_r, $I^{\langle r \rangle} \subset (x_r)$, $I' \cap (x_r) = x_r I'$, and the ring A has a minimal free resolution over $R^\star$ of the form*

$$0 \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m_r} R^\star(-n_i^r) \xrightarrow{\Phi} \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m_r} R^\star(\kappa_i) \xrightarrow{\pi} A \longrightarrow 0 \tag{19}$$

with homogeneous homomorphisms Φ and π of degree zero. Here, $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{m_r} R^\star(\kappa_i) \cong R/I'$ as $R^\star$-modules and the integers $\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_{m_r}$ satisfy $\kappa_l \leq \kappa_{l+1} \leq \kappa_l + 1$ for all $1 \leq l < m_r$ and $\kappa_{m_r} = 0$.

Proof. The exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow I \longrightarrow R \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow 0 \tag{20}$$

induces an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathrm{Tor}_1^{R^\star}(A, \bar{R}^\star) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon'''} I/x_r I \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} R/(x_r) \longrightarrow A/x_r A \longrightarrow 0. \tag{21}$$

By Lemma 3.3, the set $\{\ \tilde{f}_l^i \mid 1 \leq i \leq r,\ 1 \leq l \leq m_i\ \}$ is a pseudo Weierstrass basis of $I/x_r I$ with respect to $x_1, \dots, x_{r-1}$ and $I^{\langle r \rangle}/x_r I^{\langle r \rangle} \cong \bigoplus_{l=1}^{m_r} k \tilde{f}_l^r = I^{\langle r \rangle} + x_r I/x_r I = H^0_{\mathfrak{n}}(I/x_r I) = \mathrm{Ker}(\varepsilon) \cong \mathrm{Tor}_1^{R^\star}(A, \bar{R}^\star)$. In particular, $f_l^r \in (x_r)$ for all $1 \leq l \leq m_r$. Hence $I^{\langle r \rangle} \subset (x_r)$. Moreover, $I' \cap (x_r) \subset I^{\langle r \rangle} + x_r I = I^{\langle r \rangle} + x_r I'$ since $I' \cap (x_r) \pmod{x_r I} \subset \mathrm{Ker}(\varepsilon)$. Hence $I' \cap (x_r) = x_r I'$. On the other hand, the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow I^{\langle r \rangle} = I/I' \longrightarrow R/I' \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow 0 \tag{22}$$

yields another exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \longrightarrow \operatorname{Tor}_1^{R^\star}(R/I', \bar{R}^\star) \longrightarrow \operatorname{Tor}_1^{R^\star}(A, \bar{R}^\star) &\xrightarrow{\varepsilon''} I^{\langle r\rangle}/x_r I^{\langle r\rangle} \\ &\longrightarrow R/I' + (x_r) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon'} A/x_r A \longrightarrow 0. \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

One has the natural morphism over $R^\star$ from the complex (20) to (22), which induces a morphism from (21) to (23). The map ε''' followed by the natural surjection from $I/x_r I$ to $I/x_r I + I' = I^{\langle r\rangle}/x_r I^{\langle r\rangle}$, therefore, coincides with ε''. Since $\operatorname{Im}(\varepsilon''') = \operatorname{Ker}(\varepsilon) = I^{\langle r\rangle} + x_r I/x_r I$, it follows that $\operatorname{Ker}(\varepsilon'') = \operatorname{Ker}(\varepsilon''') = 0$. On the other hand, the map ε' is an isomorphism since $I^{\langle r\rangle} \subset (x_r)$ as we have already seen, so that ε'' is surjective. In consequence, one finds that $\operatorname{Tor}_1^{R^\star}(R/I', \bar{R}^\star) = 0$. Hence R/I' is a finitely generated graded free module over $R^\star$. Since $l_{R^\star}(A) < \infty$, the rank of R/I' over $R^\star$ coincides with that of $I^{\langle r\rangle}$. The exact sequence (22) gives the desired minimal free resolution (19). With no loss of generality, we can choose $\kappa_1, \ldots, \kappa_{m_r}$ so that they form a nondecreasing sequence. Suppose $\kappa_{l_0+1} > \kappa_{l_0} + 1$ for some $1 \le l_0 < m_r$. Then $[R]_1 [A]_{\le -\kappa_{l_0+1}} \subset [A]_{\le -\kappa_{l_0+1}+1} \subset R^\star [A]_{\le -\kappa_{l_0+1}}$ by (19). Hence $R\,[A]_{\le -\kappa_{l_0+1}} \subset R^\star [A]_{\le -\kappa_{l_0+1}} \ne A$. Since $1 \in [A]_0$, the largest κ_{m_r} must be 0. This means that $1 \in [A]_{\le -\kappa_{l_0+1}}$, therefore $R\,[A]_{\le -\kappa_{l_0+1}} = A$, which is a contradiction. Thus $\kappa_l \le \kappa_{l+1} \le \kappa_l + 1$ for all $1 \le l < m_r$. □

Lemma 4.2. *With the notation above,*

$$-\kappa_1 = n^{r-1}_{m_{r-1}} - 1 = \max\{\ d \mid [A/x_r A]_d \ne 0\ \}.$$

Proof. It follows from the exact sequence (21) that $\bar{I} = \operatorname{Im}(\varepsilon) \cong \tilde{I}/H^0_{\mathfrak{n}}(\tilde{I})$. Observe that the basic sequences of I and $\tilde{I}$ are the same and that the basic sequence of $\bar{I}$ is $(a; n^2_1, \ldots, n^2_a; \cdots; n^{r-1}_1, \ldots, n^{r-1}_{m_{r-1}})$ (cf. [3, Lemma 2.4]). By Lemma 4.1 applied to $\bar{A}$, there is a minimal free resolution of $\bar{A}$ over $R^\star$ of the form

$$0 \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m_{r-1}} R^\star(-n^{r-1}_i) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m_{r-1}} R^\star(\tilde{\kappa}_i) \longrightarrow \bar{A} \longrightarrow 0,$$

so that $\min\{\ d \mid \left[\operatorname{Ext}^1_{R^\star}(\bar{A}, R^\star)\right]_d \ne 0\ \} = -n^{r-1}_{m_{r-1}}$. In addition, $\operatorname{Ext}^1_{R^\star}(\bar{A}, R^\star) \cong \operatorname{Hom}_k(\bar{A}, k)(1)$ by duality. Hence $\min\{\ d \mid \left[\operatorname{Hom}_k(\bar{A}, k)\right]_d \ne 0\ \} = -n^{r-1}_{m_{r-1}} + 1$. On the other hand, $\max\{\ d \mid \left[\bar{A}\right]_d \ne 0\ \} = -\kappa_1$ by (19). Thus $-\kappa_1 = -(-n^{r-1}_{m_{r-1}} + 1)$, which proves our assertion. □

Lemma 4.3. *With the notation of Lemma 4.1, let $\{e_1, \ldots, e_{m_r}\}$ be the canonical basis of $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{m_r} R^\star(\kappa_i)$, and for each $1 \le i \le m_r$, let $\check{g}_i$ denote a homogeneous element of R satisfying $e_i = \check{g}_i \pmod{I'}$ via the isomorphism $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{m_r} R^\star(\kappa_i) \cong R/I'$. Denoting by φ_{ij} the (i,j)-component of Φ, put $e^r_l := \sum_{i=1}^{m_r} \varphi_{il} \check{g}_i \in I$. Then $\check{P} := \{\ f^i_l \mid 1 \le i \le r-1,\ 1 \le l \le m_i\ \} \cup \{ e^r_l \mid 1 \le l \le m_r\ \}$ is a pseudo Weierstrass basis of I with respect to $x_1, \ldots, x_r$.*

Proof. By its construction, $\check{P}$ satisfies the conditions (i) – (iv) of Definition 3.1. On the other hand $e_l^r \in I^{\langle r\rangle} + x_r I = x_r I' + I^{[r]}$ by (21), since e_l^r lies in $I \cap (x_r)$, i.e. $e_l^r \pmod{x_r I} \in \operatorname{Ker}(\varepsilon)$. Moreover, since $I' \cap (x_r) = x_r I'$ and since both $\{e_1^r, \dots, e_{m_r}^r\}$ and $\{f_1^r, \dots, f_{m_r}^r\}$ modulo I' form free bases of I/I' over $R^\star$, it follows that $f_l^r \in \sum_{i=1}^{m_r} R^\star e_i^r + x_r I'$. With the use of these observations the verification of the condition (v) of Definition 3.1 can now easily be carried out for $\check{P}$. □

The next lemma will be used afterwards in Section 5.

Lemma 4.4. *With the notation of Lemma 4.3, assume that* $f_l^r = \sum_{i=1}^{m_r} \varphi_{il}\check{g}_i$ *for all* $1 \le l \le m_r$ *from the first, namely* $P = \check{P}$. *Put* $P_1 := P - \{\ f_l^r \mid 1 \le l \le m_r\ \}$. *Suppose further that there are* $f_1, \dots, f_s \in P_1$ *satisfying the following two conditions.*

(i) *The polynomials* $\bar{f}_1, \dots, \bar{f}_s$ *generate* $\bar{I}$ *minimally over* $\bar{R}$.

(ii) $P_1 - \{f_1, \dots, f_s\} \subset \sum_{i=1}^{s} R f_i$.

Let X_i $(1 \le i \le \rho)$ *be the matrices and* θ_{ijl} $(1 \le l \le m_r)$ *the columns of* $[X_i, X_j]$ *mentioned in Section 2 associated with* (19). *If* $1 \le l \le m_r$ *and*

$$\dim_k([H^0_{\mathfrak{n}}(\tilde{I})/\mathfrak{n}H^0_{\mathfrak{n}}(\tilde{I})]_{-\kappa_l+2}) + \dim_k([\bar{I}/\mathfrak{n}\bar{I}]_{-\kappa_l+2}) = \dim_k([\tilde{I}/\mathfrak{n}\tilde{I}]_{-\kappa_l+2}), \tag{24}$$

then $\theta_{ijl} \in \sum_{i=1}^{\rho} X_i \,[\operatorname{Im}(\varPhi)]_{-\kappa_l+1} + x_r\,[\operatorname{Im}(\varPhi)]_{-\kappa_l+1}$.

Proof. Let $f_{s+1}, \dots, f_{s+t}$ be elements of $\{\ f_l^r \mid 1 \le l \le m_r\ \}$ such that $\tilde{f}_{s+1}, \dots, \tilde{f}_{s+t}$ minimally generate $H^0_{\mathfrak{n}}(\tilde{I})$ over $\bar{R}$. Since there is an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow H^0_{\mathfrak{n}}(\tilde{I}) \longrightarrow \tilde{I} \longrightarrow \bar{I} \longrightarrow 0$$

by (21) and since the condition (i) holds, it follows that $\tilde{I}$ is generated by $\tilde{f}_1, \dots, \tilde{f}_{s+t}$ over $\bar{R}$. Hence $I \subset (f_1, \dots, f_{s+t})$. Moreover

$$I^{\langle r\rangle} \subset \sum_{j=1}^{t} R f_{s+j} + x_r I^{\langle r\rangle} + x_r I' \subset \sum_{j=1}^{t} R f_{s+j} + x_r \sum_{i=1}^{s} R f_i,$$

since $I' \subset (f_1, \dots, f_s)$ by the condition (ii). Now let $\phi_{i,\mu\nu}$ denote the (μ,ν)-component of X_i. We have $x_j\check{g}_l \in \sum_{\nu=1}^{m_r} \check{g}_\nu \phi_{j,\nu l} + I'$ and $x_i x_j \check{g}_l \in \sum_{\mu=1}^{m_r}\sum_{\nu=1}^{m_r} \check{g}_\mu \phi_{i,\mu\nu}\phi_{j,\nu l} + RI'$. Likewise, $x_j x_i \check{g}_l \in \sum_{\mu=1}^{m_r}\sum_{\nu=1}^{m_r} \check{g}_\mu \phi_{j,\mu\nu}\phi_{i,\nu l} + RI'$. After subtraction,

$$f := (\check{g}_1, \dots, \check{g}_{m_r})\theta_{ijl} = \sum_{\mu=1}^{m_r} \check{g}_\mu \sum_{\nu=1}^{m_r} (\phi_{i,\mu\nu}\phi_{j,\nu l} - \phi_{j,\mu\nu}\phi_{i,\nu l}) \in RI' = (f_1, \dots, f_s).$$

On the other hand, $\theta_{ijl} \in \operatorname{Im}(\varPhi)$, so that $f \in I^{\langle r\rangle}$. Thus we can write $f = \sum_{i=1}^{s} h_i f_i + \sum_{j=1}^{t} h'_j f_{j+s} = \sum_{i=1}^{s} h''_i f_i$ with homogeneous $h_i \in x_r R$ and $h'_j,\ h''_i \in R$. Notice that

$\deg f = -\kappa_l + 2$. Our assumption (24) means that the elements of degree $-\kappa_l + 2$ taken from $\tilde{f}_1, \ldots, \tilde{f}_{s+t}$ are linearly independent over k when considered modulo $\mathfrak{n}\tilde{I}$. Since $\sum_{i=1}^{s}(h_i - h_i'')f_i + \sum_{j=1}^{t} h_j' f_{s+j} = 0$, we must have $h_i - h_i''$ and h_j' lie in $\mathfrak{m}$ for all i, j. Moreover, $RI^{\langle r\rangle} = RI^{[r]} \subset x_r I' + I^{[r]} = x_r I' + I^{\langle r\rangle}$ by Lemma 3.5 and $RI' \subset I' + I^{\langle r\rangle}$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} f \in x_r RI' + (x_1, \ldots, x_r)RI^{\langle r\rangle} &\subset x_r I' + (x_1, \ldots, x_r)x_r I' + (x_1, \ldots, x_r)I^{\langle r\rangle} \\ &\subset (x_1, \ldots, x_r)I^{\langle r\rangle} + x_r I' \\ &\subset (\check{g}_1, \ldots, \check{g}_{m_r})\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\rho} X_i \operatorname{Im}(\Phi) + x_r \operatorname{Im}(\Phi)\right) + I'. \end{aligned}$$

This implies our assertion. ☐

Definition 4.5. A graded ring A has the weak Lefschetz property (WLP) if there is an element $\ell \in [A]_1$ such that

$$\times\ell : [A]_i \longrightarrow [A]_{i+1}$$

has maximal rank for every $i \in \mathbf{Z}$. A has the strong Lefschetz property (SLP) if there is an element $\ell \in [A]_1$ such that

$$\times\ell^d : [A]_i \longrightarrow [A]_{i+d}$$

has maximal rank for every $i \in \mathbf{Z}$ and $d \in \mathbf{N}$.

We are concerned only with WLP in this paper. In the case $\operatorname{char}(k) = 0$, another proof is available for the lemma below in [1, Proposition 3.4].

Lemma 4.6. *The graded ring A has the WLP if and only if $n_1^r \geq n_{m_{r-1}}^{r-1}$.*

Proof. Since $\max\{ -\kappa_l \mid 1 \leq l \leq m_r \} = -\kappa_1$ and $\min\{ n_l^r \mid 1 \leq l \leq m_r \} = n_1^r$, the map $\times x_r : [A]_i \longrightarrow [A]_{i+1}$ is surjective for all $i \geq -\kappa_1$ and injective for all $i < n_1^r - 1$ by Lemma 4.1. If $n_1^r \geq r_{m_{r-1}}^{r-1}$, then $-\kappa_1 = n_{m_{r-1}}^{r-1} - 1 \leq n_1^r - 1$, it has therefore maximal rank for all $i \in \mathbf{Z}$, that is, A has the WLP. On the contrary, suppose that $n_1^r < r_{m_{r-1}}^{r-1}$. Then $-\kappa_1 \geq n_1^r$. Since $\kappa_l \leq \kappa_{l+1} \leq \kappa_l + 1$ for all $1 \leq l < m_r$ and $\kappa_{m_r} = 0$, there is an l_1 such that $-\kappa_{l_1} = n_1^r$. In this case the map $\times x_r : [A]_{n_1^r - 1} \longrightarrow [A]_{n_1^r}$ can neither be surjective nor injective. Since the linear form x_r is sufficiently general, this means that A does not have the WLP. ☐

Put $\operatorname{socd}(A) := \max\{ d \mid [A]_d \neq 0 \}$.

Lemma 4.7. *With the notation above, suppose further that A is Gorenstein. Then,* $\operatorname{socd}(A) = n^r_{m_r} - 1$ *and there is a minimal free resolution of A over $R^\star$ of the form*

$$0 \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m_r} R^\star(-n^r_i) \xrightarrow{\Phi} \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m_r} R^\star(-n^r_{m_r} + n^r_i) \xrightarrow{\pi} A \longrightarrow 0 \tag{25}$$

with homogeneous homomorphisms Φ and π of degree zero.

Proof. By Lemma 4.1, one sees that $\operatorname{Ext}^1_{R^\star}(A, R^\star)$ is a factor module of $\bigoplus_{l=1}^{m_r} R^\star(n^r_l)$ by its submodule contained in $x_r \bigoplus_{l=1}^{m_r} R^\star(n^r_l)$. This implies that

$$\min\{\ d \mid \left[\operatorname{Ext}^1_{R^\star}(A, R^\star)\right]_d \neq 0\ \} = -n^r_{m_r}.$$

On the other hand,

$$\min\{\ d \mid [\operatorname{Hom}_k(A, k)]_d \neq 0\ \} = -\operatorname{socd}(A)$$

and $\operatorname{Ext}^r_R(A, R)(-r) \cong \operatorname{Hom}_k(A, k) \cong \operatorname{Ext}^1_{R^\star}(A, R^\star)(-1)$. Hence $\operatorname{socd}(A) = n^r_{m_r} - 1$. Since $\operatorname{Ext}^1_{R^\star}(A, R^\star) \cong \operatorname{Hom}_k(A, k)(1) \cong A(\operatorname{socd}(A) + 1)$, it follows from the dual of (19) over $R^\star$ that $(\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_{m_r}) = (-\operatorname{socd}(A) - 1 + n^r_1, \dots, -\operatorname{socd}(A) - 1 + n^r_{m_r}) = (-n^r_{m_r} + n^r_1, \dots, -n^r_{m_r} + n^r_{m_r})$. Thus one obtains the exact sequence (25). ☐

Remark 4.8. In the case A is Gorenstein, one has $0 :_A \mathfrak{m} \cong k(-\operatorname{socd}(A))$ and

$$A(n^r_{m_r} - 1) \cong \operatorname{Ext}^r_R(A, R)(-r) \cong \operatorname{Ext}^1_{R^\star}(A, R^\star)(-1) \cong \operatorname{Hom}_k(A, k), \tag{26}$$

as mentioned in the above proof. Moreover,

$$(0 :_A x_r)(\operatorname{socd}(A)) = \operatorname{Hom}_k(\bar{A}, k) = \operatorname{Ext}^{r-1}_{\bar{R}}(\bar{A}, \bar{R})(-r + 1). \tag{27}$$

Corollary 4.9. *If A is Gorenstein,*

$$n^r_{m_r} - n^r_1 = n^{r-1}_{m_{r-1}} - 1 = \max\{\ d \mid [A/x_rA]_d \neq 0\ \}.$$

Proof. Clear by Lemmas 4.2 and 4.7. ☐

Let $\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_{m_r}$, Φ and π be as in Lemma 4.1, and X_j $(1 \le j \le \rho)$ be the matrices as stated in Section 2. We identify Φ with the matrix representing itself. Put $L := \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m_r} R^\star(\kappa_i)$ and $F := \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m_r} R^\star(-n^r_i)$. For each $1 \le i \le \rho$, let Y_i be a matrix in $R^\star$ which gives a homogeneous homomorphism $Y_i : F(-1) \longrightarrow F$ satisfying $X_i\Phi = \Phi Y_i$. Since $\pi X_i \Phi = x_i \pi \Phi = 0$, such a Y_i exists indeed for each i and is determined uniquely by X_i and Φ. They make the following diagram commutative :

$$\begin{tikzcd} F(-1) \arrow[r, "\Phi"] \arrow[d, "Y_i"'] & L(-1) \arrow[r, "\pi"] \arrow[d, "X_i"] & A(-1) \arrow[d, "\times x_i"] \\ F \arrow[r, "\Phi"] & L \arrow[r, "\pi"] & A \end{tikzcd} . \tag{28}$$

For a module M over $R^\star$, we will denote by $M^\vee$ the dual module $\operatorname{Hom}_{R^\star}(M, R^\star)$.

Remark 4.10. Suppose that A is Gorenstein.

(1) Since the dual of (25) gives a minimal free resolution of the $R^\star$-module $A(n^r_{m_r}) \cong \mathrm{Ext}^1_{R^\star}(A, R^\star)$ over $R^\star$, we may assume that $\mathrm{Im}(\varPhi) = \mathrm{Im}^{R^\star}({}^t\varPhi)$. Moreover, since the isomorphism $A(n^r_{m_r}) \cong \mathrm{Ext}^1_{R^\star}(A, R^\star)$ is also an isomorphism over R, the multiplication by ${}^tY_i$ of an element of $F^\vee$ represents the multiplication by x_i of the corresponding element of A. We can therefore choose X_i, Y_i $(1 \le i \le \rho)$ and $\varPhi$ so that every column of ${}^tY_i - X_i$ lies in $\mathrm{Im}(\varPhi)$. In particular, ${}^tY_i \equiv X_i \pmod{x_r R^\star}$.

(2) Without changing F and L, one can normalize $\varPhi$ to a symmetric matrix such that there is only one nonzero component in each row and column. But when that is done, one may only be able to say that every column of $C^{-1}{}^tY_iC - X_i$ lies in $\mathrm{Im}(\varPhi)$ with an invertible matrix C. Moreover, A has the strong Lefschetz property if and only if a normal form of $\varPhi$ mentioned above is a diagonal matrix.

The canonical basis of F (resp. L) over $R^\star$ will be denoted by $\{e^F_1, \dots, e^F_{m_r}\}$ (resp. $\{e^L_1, \dots, e^L_{m_r}\}$). Further, the canonical basis of $L^\vee$ will be denoted by $\{e^{L*}_1, \dots, e^{L*}_{m_r}\}$ in a standard way. Given an integer u with $1 \le u \le m_r$, let

$$M_{1,u} := \sum_{l=1}^{u} R^\star[X_1, \dots, X_\rho]\varPhi e^F_l,$$

$$M_{2,u} := \sum_{l=1}^{u} R^\star[{}^tX_1, \dots, {}^tX_\rho]e^{L*}_l, \quad M_{3,u} := \sum_{l=1}^{u} R^\star[Y_1, \dots, Y_\rho]e^F_l.$$

Then, $M_{1,u}$ is a submodule of L over the $R^\star$-algebra $R^\star[X_1, \dots, X_\rho]$, $M_{2,u}$ a submodule of $L^\vee$ over $R^\star[{}^tX_1, \dots, {}^tX_\rho]$, and $M_{3,u}$ a submodule of F over $R^\star[Y_1, \dots, Y_\rho]$. Notice that $R^\star[X_1, \dots, X_\rho]\varPhi e^F_l = \varPhi R^\star[Y_1, \dots, Y_\rho]e^F_l$ for all $1 \le l \le m_r$ by the commutativity of (28).

Lemma 4.11. *With the notation above, we have* $M_{1,u} = \varPhi M_{3,u}$ *and* $\mathrm{rank}_{R^\star}(M_{1,u}) = \mathrm{rank}_{R^\star}(M_{3,u})$ *for all* $1 \le u \le m_r$.

Proof. Since $\varPhi$ is a square matrix with $\det(\varPhi) \ne 0$ by Lemma 4.1, our assertion follows from the preceding observation. □

Lemma 4.12. *With the notation above, suppose that* $n^r_1 < n^{r-1}_{m_{r-1}}$. *Put* $p := \max\{\, l \mid n^r_1 + \kappa_l \le 0,\ 1 \le l \le m_r \,\}$ *and* $\check{p} := \max\{\, l \mid n^r_l + \kappa_p \le 0,\ 1 \le l \le m_r \,\}$, *and let* $N_p := 0^p \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{i=p+1}^{m_r} R^\star(\kappa_i)\right) \subset L$ *be the* $R^\star$ *module as in Section 1. Suppose further that* $R^\star[X_1, \dots, X_\rho]\,[\mathrm{Im}(\varPhi)]_{\le -\kappa_p} \subset N_p$. *Then the following assertions hold, where* $(\ ,\ )$ *denotes the canonical pairing of* L *and* $L^\vee$.

(1) $M_{1,\check{p}} \subset N_p$.

(2) $(v, \chi) = 0$ *for all* $v \in M_{1,\check{p}}$ *and* $\chi \in M_{2,p}$.

(3) *Given integers* u *and* u' *with* $1 \leq u \leq p$, $1 \leq u' \leq \check{p}$, *there is an injective homomorphism* $\eta_{u,u'} : M_{2,u} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{R^\star}(L/M_{1,u'}, R^\star)$ *over* $R^\star[{}^tX_1, \dots, {}^tX_\rho]$ *under which the image of* $\chi \in M_{2,u}$ *is the homomorphism* $\eta_{u,u'}(\chi)$ *defined by* $\eta_{u,u'}(\chi)(\bar{v}) = (v, \chi)$ *for* $\bar{v} = v \pmod{M_{1,u'}} \in L/M_{1,u'}$.

(4) $\mathrm{rank}_{R^\star}(M_{1,\check{p}}) + \mathrm{rank}_{R^\star}(M_{2,p}) \leq \mathrm{rank}_{R^\star}(L) = m_r$.

Proof. Suppose $n_1^r < r_{m_{r-1}}^{r-1}$. Then $n_1^r + \kappa_1 = n_1^r - n_{m_{r-1}}^{r-1} + 1 \leq 0$ by Lemma 4.2, so that p and $\check{p}$ exist. Let φ_i be the i-th column of $\varPhi$ for $1 \leq i \leq m_r$. Since φ_1 is different from zero and its components lie in $x_r R^\star$, we see $p < m_r$, $\kappa_p < \kappa_{p+1}$. Suppose further that $R^\star[X_1, \dots, X_\rho]\,[\mathrm{Im}(\varPhi)]_{\leq -\kappa_p} \subset N_p$.

(1) For every $1 \leq l \leq \check{p}$, one has $\deg(\varPhi e_l^F) = n_l^r \leq -\kappa_p$, in other words, $\varPhi e_l^F \in [\mathrm{Im}(\varPhi)]_{\leq -\kappa_p}$. Therefore $R^\star[X_1, \dots, X_\rho]\varPhi e_l^F \in N_p$ for every $1 \leq l \leq \check{p}$ by our assumption. Hence $M_{1,\check{p}} \subset N_p$.

(2) Given $v \in M_{1,\check{p}}$ and $\chi \in M_{2,p}$, $(X_i v, \chi) = (v, {}^tX_i \chi)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq \rho$. It is therefore enough to verify that $(v, e_l^{L*}) = 0$ for all $v \in M_{1,\check{p}}$ and $1 \leq l \leq p$. But this holds since $M_{1,\check{p}} \subset N_p$ by (1).

(3) The assertion can be verified with the use of (2).

(4) By (3), we can consider the homomorphism $\eta_{p,\check{p}} : M_{2,p} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{R^\star}(L/M_{1,\check{p}}, R^\star)$. Since $\eta_{p,\check{p}}$ is injective, $\mathrm{rank}_{R^\star}(M_{2,p}) \leq \mathrm{rank}_{R^\star}(L/M_{1,\check{p}}) = \mathrm{rank}_{R^\star}(L) - \mathrm{rank}_{R^\star}(M_{1,\check{p}})$, which proves our assertion. $\square$

Next we consider the modules, the matrices and the homomorphisms which have appeared so far modulo x_r. Put $\bar{R}^\star := R^\star/x_r R^\star = k$, $\bar{L} := L/x_r L = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m_r} k(\kappa_i)$, $\bar{F} := F/x_r F = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m_r} k(-n_i^r)$, and $\bar{L}^* := L^\vee/x_r L^\vee \cong \mathrm{Hom}_k(L, k)$. Denoting $X_i \pmod{x_r}$ and $Y_i \pmod{x_r}$ by $\bar{X}_i$ and $\bar{Y}_i$ respectively, let further

$$\bar{M}_{2,u} = \sum_{l=1}^{u} k[{}^t\bar{X}_1, \dots, {}^t\bar{X}_\rho]\bar{e}_l^{L*} \subset \bar{L}^*,$$

$$\bar{M}_{3,u} = \sum_{l=1}^{u} k[\bar{Y}_1, \dots, \bar{Y}_\rho]\bar{e}_l^{F} \subset \bar{F}$$

for $1 \leq u \leq m_r$. We have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\bar{L}(-1) \arrow[r, "\bar{\pi}", "\sim"'] \arrow[d, "\bar{X}_i"] & \bar{A}(-1) \arrow[d, "\times x_i"] \\
\bar{L} \arrow[r, "\bar{\pi}", "\sim"'] & \bar{A}
\end{tikzcd} .$$

Besides,

$$\bar{L} \cong \bar{A}, \quad \bar{F} \cong \mathrm{Tor}_1^{R^\star}(A, \bar{R}^\star) \cong (0 :_A x_r)(-1), \tag{29}$$

$$\bar{L}^* \cong \mathrm{Hom}_k(\bar{A}, k) \cong \mathrm{Ext}_{\bar{R}}^{r-1}(\bar{A}, \bar{R})(-r+1), \tag{30}$$

$$\mathrm{rank}_k(\mathrm{Ext}_{\bar{R}}^{r-1}(\bar{A}, \bar{R})) = m_r. \tag{31}$$

Furthermore, if A is Gorenstein,

$$\bar{M}_{2,u} \cong \bar{M}_{3,u}(n_{m_r}^r) \quad \text{for all } 1 \le u \le m_r \tag{32}$$

by (1) of Remark 4.10.

Lemma 4.13. *With the same assumption and notation as in Lemma 4.12, we have* $\mathrm{rank}_k(\bar{M}_{3,\check{p}}) + \mathrm{rank}_k(\bar{M}_{2,p}) \le m_r$.

Proof. Let $w_1, \dots, w_\delta$ be elements of $M_{3,\check{p}}$ such that $\bar{w}_1, \dots, \bar{w}_\delta \in \bar{M}_{3,\check{p}}$ are linearly independent over k with $\bar{w}_i := w_i \pmod{x_r}$. Then $w_1, \dots, w_\delta$ are linearly independent over $R^\star$, too. Since every element of $\bar{M}_{3,\check{p}}$ comes from that of $M_{3,\check{p}}$ modulo x_r, we see $\mathrm{rank}_k(\bar{M}_{3,\check{p}}) \le \mathrm{rank}_{R^\star}(M_{3,\check{p}})$. The same holds for $M_{2,p}$ and $\bar{M}_{2,p}$. Hence $\mathrm{rank}_k(\bar{M}_{3,\check{p}}) + \mathrm{rank}_k(\bar{M}_{2,p}) \le \mathrm{rank}_{R^\star}(M_{3,\check{p}}) + \mathrm{rank}_{R^\star}(M_{2,p})$. On the other hand, $\mathrm{rank}_{R^\star}(M_{1,\check{p}}) = \mathrm{rank}_{R^\star}(M_{3,\check{p}})$ by Lemma 4.11. Thus $\mathrm{rank}_k(\bar{M}_{3,\check{p}}) + \mathrm{rank}_k(\bar{M}_{2,p}) \le m_r$ by (4) of Lemma 4.12. ☐

Remark 4.14. Observe that $\pi(\Phi e_l^F / x_r) \in 0 :_A x_r$ by the argument of the proof of Proposition 2.5. Let p and $\check{p}$ be as in Lemma 4.12. Since R and A are commutative, we find by Theorem 2.1 that $R\pi(\Phi e_l^F / x_r) \subset \pi(N_p)$ for all $1 \le l \le \check{p}$ if $\mathrm{char}(k) = 0$ and Γ is sufficiently general.

Lemma 4.15. *Let $g_1, \dots, g_r \in R$ be homogeneous polynomials of degrees $d_1, \dots, d_r$ respectively which form an R-regular sequence and let $I := (g_1, \dots, g_r) \subset R$. Suppose that Γ is chosen sufficiently generally.*

(1) *If* $\mathrm{char}(k) = 0$ *and* $2d_i < d_1 + \cdots + d_r - r + 2$ *for all* $1 \le i \le r$, *then* $\bar{I} := I + (x_r)/(x_r) \subset \bar{R}$ *is minimally generated by* $\bar{g}_1, \dots, \bar{g}_r$ *over* R, *where* $\bar{g}_i := g_i \pmod{(x_r)}$.

(2) *If* $2d_i \ge d_1 + \cdots + d_r - r + 2$ *for some* $1 \le i \le r$, *then* R/I *has the WLP.*

Proof. For the case $r = 3$, see [10], too. Now, let us prove (1) first. Suppose to the contrary. Rearranging $g_1, \dots, g_r$ if necessary, we may assume without loss of generality that $\bar{g}_r \in (\bar{g}_1, \dots, \bar{g}_{r-1})$ for all sufficiently general Γ. Put $A' := R/(g_1, \dots, g_{r-1})$ and $\bar{A}' := A'/x_r A'$. Then $\bar{A} = \bar{A}'$. Since $\bar{g}_1, \dots, \bar{g}_{r-1}$ form an $\bar{R}$-regular sequence, we see $0 :_A x_r \cong \mathrm{Ext}_{\bar{R}}^{r-1}(\bar{A}, \bar{R})(-r+1-\mathrm{socd}(A)) \cong \bar{A}'(-d_r+1)$ by (27). The module $0 :_A x_r$ is therefore generated over R by $[0 :_A x_r]_{\le d_r - 1}$. On the other hand, $\mathrm{socd}(\bar{A}) = \mathrm{socd}(\bar{A}') =$

$d_1 + \cdots + d_{r-1} - (r-1)$. Hence we must have $d_r > d_1 + \cdots + d_{r-1} - r + 1$ by (3) of Proposition 2.5, which contradicts our hypothesis.

To prove (2), we may assume with no loss of generality that $2d_r \geq d_1 + \cdots + d_r - r + 2$, rearranging $g_1, \ldots, g_r$ if necessary. Let the notation be the same as above. Since $g_1, \ldots, g_{r-1}, x_r$ form an R-regular sequence, the R-module A' is a free module over $R^\star$, so that there is a nondecreasing sequence $\kappa_1, \ldots, \kappa_Q$ such that $A' \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R^\star(\kappa_i)$. Here, $-\kappa_1 = \operatorname{socd}(\bar{A}') = d_1 + \cdots + d_{r-1} - (r-1)$. We obtain a free resolution

$$0 \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R^\star(-\kappa'_i) \xrightarrow{\Phi} \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R^\star(\kappa_i) \cong A' \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow 0 \tag{33}$$

of $A := R/I$ over $R^\star$ with another nondecreasing sequence $\kappa'_1, \ldots, \kappa'_{Q'}$. Let $\hat{g}_r$ denote $g_r \pmod{(g_1, \ldots, g_{r-1})}$. Since $\operatorname{Im}(\Phi) = R\hat{g}_r$, we have $\kappa'_1 = d_r$. Hence $\kappa'_1 + \kappa_1 = d_r + \kappa_1 \geq 1$. This implies that the resolution (33) is minimal and that A has the WLP by the argument of the proof of Lemma 4.6. □

§5. The case where $r = 3$ and $0 :_A x_3$ is minimally generated by two elements

In this section, we consider homogeneous ideals I in R with $r = 3$ defining Gorenstein graded rings R/I of dimension zero such that $0 :_A x_3$ is minimally generated by two elements. For our purpose, it is necessary to have information on free resolutions of $\bar{I}$ over $\bar{R}$ in relation with free resolutions of I over R. Let us begin with some general properties.

Lemma 5.1. *Let E be a finitely generated graded R-module of* $\operatorname{depth}_{\mathfrak{m}}(E) \geq r - s + 1$ *($1 \leq s \leq r$), $\bar{R} := R/(x_s, \ldots, x_r)$, $\bar{\mathfrak{m}} := \mathfrak{m}/(x_s, \ldots, x_r)$ and $E_{\bar{R}} := E/(x_s, \ldots, x_r)E$. Let further $\bar{\lambda}'_\bullet : \bar{G}'_\bullet \longrightarrow E_{\bar{R}}/H^0_{\bar{\mathfrak{m}}}(E_{\bar{R}})$ and $\bar{\lambda}''_\bullet : \bar{G}''_\bullet \longrightarrow H^0_{\bar{\mathfrak{m}}}(E_{\bar{R}})$ be free resolutions of $E_{\bar{R}}/H^0_{\bar{\mathfrak{m}}}(E_{\bar{R}})$ and $H^0_{\bar{\mathfrak{m}}}(E_{\bar{R}})$ respectively over $\bar{R}$. Suppose that the linear forms $x_s, \ldots, x_r$ form an E-regular sequence. Then, there is a free resolution $\lambda_\bullet : G_\bullet \longrightarrow E$ of E having the following properties.*

(i) *$G_j = G'_j \oplus G''_j$ for all $j \geq 0$.*

(ii) *Let $\varpi'_j : G_j \longrightarrow G'_j$ and $\varpi''_j : G_j \longrightarrow G''_j$ be the natural projections and put $\lambda^{(1)}_j = \varpi' \circ \lambda_j|_{G'_j}$, $\lambda^{(3)}_j = \varpi'' \circ \lambda_j|_{G'_j}$, $\lambda^{(2)}_j = \varpi' \circ \lambda_j|_{G''_j}$, and $\lambda^{(4)}_j = \varpi'' \circ \lambda_j|_{G''_j}$. Then $\lambda^{(2)}_j \equiv 0 \pmod{(x_s, \ldots, x_r)}$ for all $j \geq 1$.*

(iii) *$(\bar{G}'_\bullet, \bar{\lambda}'_\bullet) = (G'_\bullet \otimes_R \bar{R}, \lambda^{(1)}_\bullet \otimes_R \bar{R})$ and $(\bar{G}''_\bullet, \bar{\lambda}''_\bullet) = (G''_\bullet \otimes_R \bar{R}, \lambda^{(4)}_\bullet \otimes_R \bar{R})$.*

(iv) *The map* $\lambda_1^{(3)} \otimes_R \bar{R}$ *represents the element of* $\operatorname{Ext}^1_{\bar{R}}(E_{\bar{R}}/H^0_{\bar{\mathfrak{m}}}(E_{\bar{R}}), H^0_{\bar{\mathfrak{m}}}(E_{\bar{R}}))$ *corresponding to the extension* $E_{\bar{R}}$ *of* $H^0_{\bar{\mathfrak{m}}}(E_{\bar{R}})$ *by* $E_{\bar{R}}/H^0_{\bar{\mathfrak{m}}}(E_{\bar{R}})$*.*

Proof. Since $E_{\bar{R}}$ lies in the middle of the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow H^0_{\bar{\mathfrak{m}}}(E_{\bar{R}}) \longrightarrow E_{\bar{R}} \longrightarrow E_{\bar{R}}/H^0_{\bar{\mathfrak{m}}}(E_{\bar{R}}) \longrightarrow 0, \tag{34}$$

there is a free resolution $\bar{\lambda}_\bullet : \bar{G}_\bullet \longrightarrow E_{\bar{R}}$ of $E_{\bar{R}}$ such that

$$\bar{G}_j = \bar{G}'_j \oplus \bar{G}''_j, \quad \bar{\lambda}_j = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\lambda}'_j & 0 \\ \bar{\lambda}'''_j & \bar{\lambda}''_j \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{for all} \quad j \geq 0.$$

Let G'_j (resp. G''_j) be the free R-module such that $G'_j \otimes_R \bar{R} = \bar{G}'_j$ (resp. $G''_j \otimes_R \bar{R} = \bar{G}''_j$) and $G_j := G'_j \oplus G''_j$. Since the sequence $x_s, \ldots, x_r$ is E-regular by hypothesis, one can construct a free resolution $\lambda_\bullet : G_\bullet \longrightarrow E$ satisfying all the conditions (ii) – (iv). ☐

Given a module E over R, let $\#_{min}(E)$ denote the number of the minimal generators of E over R.

Corollary 5.2. *Let* I *be a homogeneous ideal in* R *such that the graded ring* $A := R/I$ *is of dimension zero and let* $\bar{A} := A/x_rA$ *and* $\bar{I} := I+(x_r)/(x_r)$*. Then* $\#_{min}(I) \leq \#_{min}(\bar{I}) + \#_{min}(0 :_A x_r)$*. If further* A *is Gorenstein, then* $\#_{min}(I) \leq \#_{min}(\bar{I}) + \#_{min}(\operatorname{Ext}^{r-1}_{\bar{R}}(\bar{A}, \bar{R}))$*.*

Proof. By (21), $0 :_A x_r \cong \operatorname{Tor}_1^{R^\star}(A, \bar{R}^\star)(1) \cong H^0_{\mathfrak{n}}(\tilde{I})(1)$ and $\tilde{I}/H^0_{\mathfrak{n}}(\tilde{I}) \cong \bar{I}$, where $\mathfrak{n} := \mathfrak{m}/(x_r) \subset \bar{R}$ and $\tilde{I} := I/x_rI$. Our assertion therefore follows from (34) and (27) since $\#_{min}(I) = \#_{min}(\tilde{I})$. ☐

In the rest of this section, unless otherwise specified, we assume that $r = 3$ and that I is a homogeneous ideal in R defining a Gorenstein graded ring $A := R/I$ of dimension zero with the property $\#_{min}(0 :_A x_3) = 2$. Notice that the condition $\#_{min}(0 :_A x_3) = 2$ is equivalent to $\#_{min}(\bar{I}) = 3$ by (27) in our case, where $\bar{I} := I + (x_3)/(x_3) \subset \bar{R} := R/(x_3) = k[x_1, x_2]$.

Example 5.3. There is indeed a Gorenstein graded ring with the property mentioned above which is not a complete intersection. Put $g_1 := -y_1^5$, $g_2 := y_1^2 y_2^3$, $g_3 := y_1^3 y_3^3 - y_2^6$, $g_4 := y_2^3 y_3^4$, $g_5 := -y_3^7$, and $I := (g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4, g_5) \subset R = k[y_1, y_2, y_3]$. For each $1 \leq i \leq 5$, the polynomial g_i is equal to the Pfaffian of $\Lambda\binom{i}{i}$ up to sign, where

$$\Lambda = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & y_3^3 & y_2^3 \\ 0 & 0 & y_3^4 & y_2^3 & y_1^3 \\ 0 & -y_3^4 & 0 & y_1^2 & 0 \\ -y_3^3 & -y_2^3 & -y_1^2 & 0 & 0 \\ -y_2^3 & -y_1^3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

and $\Lambda\binom{i}{i}$ denotes the alternating matrix obtained from Λ by deleting its i-th row and column. Hence the ring R/I is Gorenstein by [6, Theorem 2.1]. Let a and b be sufficiently general elements of k, and put $x_3 := y_3 + ay_1 + by_2$, $\bar{g}_i := g_i(y_1, y_2, -ay_1 - by_2)$ $(1 \le i \le 5)$ and $\bar{I} := (\bar{g}_1, \bar{g}_2, \bar{g}_3, \bar{g}_4, \bar{g}_5) \subset \bar{R} = R/(x_3)$. By direct computations one can verify that $\bar{I} = (\bar{g}_1, \bar{g}_2, \bar{g}_3)$. Since $J := (g_1, g_2, g_3) \subset R$ is generated by the maximal minors of $\begin{bmatrix} y_3^3 & y_2^3 & y_1^2 \\ y_2^3 & y_1^3 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, one can compute $\dim_k([J]_l)$ and $\dim_k(\left[\bar{I}\right]_l)$ for all $l \in \mathbf{Z}$ and find that $B_R(J) = B_{R'}(\bar{I}) = (5; 5, 6, 6, 7, 7)$. Since $\deg(g_4) = \deg(g_5) = 7$, it follows that $n_1^3 = 7 = n_5^2$. Hence R/I has the WLP by Lemma 4.6. In fact $B_R(I) = (5; 5, 6, 6, 7, 7; 7, 7, 8, 8, 8, 8, 9, 9, 9, 9, 9, 10, 10, 10, 10, 11, 11, 11, 12, 12, 13)$.

Lemma 5.4. *Suppose that* $\operatorname{char}(k) = 0$*,* $\#_{min}(0 :_A x_3) = 2$*, and that* Γ *is chosen sufficiently generally. Let* $(a; n_1^2, \ldots, n_a^2; n_1^3, \ldots, n_b^3)$ *be the basic sequence of* I*. Then, there are integers* n, d_1, d_2, d_3 *with* $0 < d_1 \le d_2 \le d_3$*,* $d_2 < n \le n_1^3 + 1$*,* $n \le n_a^2 + 1$ *such that* $\bar{I}$ *has a minimal free resolution of the form*

$$0 \longrightarrow \bar{R}(-n) \oplus \bar{R}(-n_a^2 - 1) \xrightarrow{\Psi} \bar{R}(-d_1) \oplus \bar{R}(-d_2) \oplus \bar{R}(-d_3) \longrightarrow \bar{I} \longrightarrow 0 \qquad (35)$$

over $\bar{R}$*.*

Proof. The basic sequence of $\bar{I}$ is $(a; n_1^2, \ldots, n_a^2)$, so that $\bar{I}$ has a free resolution of the form

$$0 \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^{a} \bar{R}(-n_i^2 - 1) \longrightarrow \bar{R}(-a) \oplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^{a} \bar{R}(-n_i^2) \longrightarrow \bar{I} \longrightarrow 0 \qquad (36)$$

(see e.g. [2, pp. 10 – 13]). Since $\#_{min}(\bar{I}) = 3$ by hypotheses, after elimination, the above resolution reduces to the form (35), where $d_1 = a$, $d_2 = n_1^2$, $d_3 = n_i^2$ and $n = n_j^2 + 1$ for some i, j with $1 < i \le a$, $i - 1 \le j < a$. It remains to show that $n \le n_1^3 + 1$. Since $\operatorname{socd}(A) = n_b^3 - 1$ and $0 :_A x_3 \cong \operatorname{Ext}^2_{\bar{R}}(\bar{A}, \bar{R})(-2 - \operatorname{socd}(A))$, it follow from (35) that the module $0 :_A x_3$ is generated by $[0 :_A x_3]_{\le n_b^3 + 1 - n}$ over R. By (2) of Proposition 2.5 and Lemma 4.7, we must have $(n_b^3 + 1 - n + 1) + (-n_b^3 + n_1^3) > 0$. Hence $n_1^3 + 1 \ge n$. $\square$

For a sequence $B = (\alpha; \bar{\nu}^2; \bar{\nu}^3) = (\alpha; \nu_1^2, \ldots, \nu_\alpha^2; \nu_1^3, \ldots, \nu_\beta^3)$ of integers, put

$$h_B(\mu) := \binom{\mu - \alpha + 2}{2}_+ + \sum_{l=1}^{\alpha} \binom{\mu - \nu_l^2 + 1}{1}_+ + \sum_{l=1}^{\beta} \binom{\mu - \nu_l^3}{0}_+$$

for $\mu \in \mathbf{Z}$, where

$$\binom{\mu}{\nu}_+ := \frac{\mu!}{(\mu - \nu)!\nu!} \quad \text{if } \mu \ge \nu \ge 0 \text{ and } \binom{\mu}{\nu}_+ := 0 \quad \text{otherwise.}$$

Given sequences B as above and $B' = (\alpha'; \bar{\nu}'^2; \bar{\nu}'^3) = (\alpha'; \nu'^2_1, \dots, \nu'^2_{\alpha'}; \nu'^3_1, \dots, \nu'^3_{\beta'})$, we will write $B \sim B'$ to mean that $h_B(\mu) = h_{B'}(\mu)$ for all $\mu \in \mathbf{Z}$. We further define a relation $B \overset{\mathrm{p}}{=} B'$ to mean that $\alpha = \alpha'$ and that $\bar{\nu}^i = \bar{\nu}'^i$ up to permutation for $i = 2, 3$. Given a sequence $(l_{j1}, \dots, l_{ji_j})$ $(1 \le j \le m)$, we will denote by $((l_{j1}, \dots, l_{ji_j})_{1 \le j \le m})$ the sequence $(l_{11}, \dots, l_{1i_1}, l_{21}, \dots, l_{2i_2}, \cdots, l_{m1}, \dots, l_{mi_m})$.

Lemma 5.5. *Let g_1, g_2 and g_3 be homogeneous polynomials in R of degrees d_1, d_2 and d_3 $(1 \le d_1 \le d_2 \le d_3)$ respectively which form an R-regular sequence. Let further $I := (g_1, g_2, g_3) \subset R$ be the homogeneous ideal generated by them. Then $B_R(I) \sim B^0$, where*

$$\bar{\nu}^{02} := (d_2, d_2 + 1, \dots, d_2 + d_1 - 1),$$
$$\bar{\nu}^{03} := ((d_3 + j, d_3 + 1 + j, \dots, d_3 + d_1 - 1 + j)_{0 \le j \le d_2 - 1})$$

and $B^0 := (d_1; \bar{\nu}^{02}; \bar{\nu}^{03})$.

Proof. It follows from the minimal free resolution of I over R that

$$\begin{aligned} h_{B_R(I)}(\mu) &= \dim_k([I]_\mu) \\ &= \binom{\mu - d_1 + 2}{2}_+ + \binom{\mu - d_2 + 2}{2}_+ + \binom{\mu - d_3 + 2}{2}_+ \\ &\quad - \binom{\mu - d_1 - d_2 + 2}{2}_+ - \binom{\mu - d_2 - d_3 + 2}{2}_+ - \binom{\mu - d_3 - d_1 + 2}{2}_+ \\ &\quad + \binom{\mu - d_1 - d_2 - d_3 + 2}{2}_+ \qquad (37) \\ &= \binom{\mu - d_1 + 2}{2}_+ + \sum_{i=0}^{d_1 - 1} \binom{\mu - d_2 - i + 1}{1}_+ + \sum_{i=0}^{d_1 - 1} \sum_{j=0}^{d_2 - 1} \binom{\mu - d_3 - i - j}{0}_+ \\ &= h_{B^0}(\mu) \end{aligned}$$

for all $\mu \in \mathbf{Z}$. This implies our assertion. □

For the sake of completeness, we will include a proof for the height three Artinian complete intersection case in our argument of the main Theorem 5.11, so that we need the following lemma which may follow from the results of [10] and [7].

Lemma 5.6. *With the notation of Lemma 5.5, let $(a; n^2_1, \dots, n^2_a; n^3_1, \dots, n^3_b)$ be the basic sequence of I and $A := R/I$. Let further n be the integer stated in Lemma 5.4. Suppose that Γ is chosen sufficiently generally and that $\mathrm{char}(k) = 0$.*

(1) *If $d_3 \ge d_1 + d_2 - 1$, then $B_R(I) \overset{\mathrm{p}}{=} B^0$. In particular, $n^2_a = d_2 + d_1 - 1 \le d_3 = n^3_1$.*

(2) *If $d_3 < d_1 + d_2 - 1$ and $n^3_1 < n^2_a$, then $n^2_a + 1 - n \ge 2$.*

Proof. Suppose first that $d_3 \geq d_1 + d_2 - 1$. Then A has the WLP by (1) of Lemma 4.15, so that $n_1^3 \geq n_a^2$ by Lemma 4.6. Since the smallest term of $\bar{\nu}^{03}$ is not less than the largest term of $\bar{\nu}^{02}$, we find by the equality $h_{B_R(I)}(\mu) = h_{B^0}(\mu)$ ($\mu \in \mathbf{Z}$) that $B_R(I) \overset{\mathrm{p}}{=} B^0$.

Next assume that $d_3 < d_1 + d_2 - 1$ and that $n_1^3 < n_a^2$. By Lemma 5.4, we have $n \leq n_1^3 + 1 \leq n_a^2 < n_a^2 + 1$, so that $n_a^2 + 1 - n \geq 1$. Since (36) reduces to (35) by eliminations, the transpose of the matrix Ψ appearing in (35) must be of the form ${}^t\Psi = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{g}_{11} & \bar{g}_{12} & \bar{g}_{13} \\ \bar{g}_{21} & \bar{g}_{22} & \bar{g}_{23} \end{pmatrix}$ with (a) $\bar{g}_{13} = 0$, $\deg(\bar{g}_{23}) = 1$ or (b) $\deg(\bar{g}_{23}) \geq 2$. Let $\bar{g}_i := g_i \pmod{(x_3)} \in \bar{R}$. In the case (a), $\bar{g}_1 = \bar{g}_{23}\bar{g}_{12}$, $\bar{g}_2 = \bar{g}_{23}\bar{g}_{11}$ up to multiplication by a constant respectively. But $\bar{g}_1, \bar{g}_2$ must be relatively prime, since the polynomials g_1, g_2, g_3 form an R-regular sequence and Γ is sufficiently general. Hence only the case (b) occurs. By (27) and (29),

$$\bigoplus_{i=1}^{b} k(-n_i^3 + 1) \cong 0 :_A x_3 \cong \mathrm{Hom}_k(\bar{A}, k)(-n_b^3 + 1) \cong \mathrm{Ext}^2_{\bar{R}}(\bar{A}, \bar{R})(-n_b^3 - 1), \tag{38}$$

and $n_1^3 - 1 = n_b^3 - n_a^2$ by Corollary 4.9. Now consider the case $n_a^2 + 1 - n = 1$. First, $\dim_k([0 :_A x_3]_{n_1^3}) = 3$ by (38) and the form of Ψ. Secondly, $n = n_1^3 + 1 = n_a^2$, so that $2n_1^3 = n_b^3 = d_1 + d_2 + d_3 - 2$. Observe that $n_1^3 - 2 - d_i \geq -2$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$) and that $n_1^3 - d_i - d_j \leq -2$ ($1 \leq i < j \leq 3$). The map $\times x_3 : [A]_{n_1^3 - 2} \longrightarrow [A]_{n_1^3 - 1}$ is injective by the argument of the proof of Lemma 4.6, $[0 :_A x_3]_{n_1^3} = [\mathrm{Hom}_k(\bar{A}, k)]_{-n_1^3 + 1}$ by (38), and $\binom{\mu+1}{2}_+ - \binom{\mu}{2}_+ = \mu$ for all $\mu \geq 0$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_k([0 :_A x_3]_{n_1^3}) &= \dim_k([\bar{A}]_{n_1^3 - 1}) = \dim_k([A]_{n_1^3 - 1}) - \dim_k([A]_{n_1^3 - 2}) \\ &= \dim_k([R]_{n_1^3 - 1}) - \dim_k([R]_{n_1^3 - 2}) - \dim_k([I]_{n_1^3 - 1}) + \dim_k([I]_{n_1^3 - 2}) = 2 \end{aligned}$$

by (37), which is a contradiction. Thus $n_a^2 + 1 - n \geq 2$. ☐

Lemma 5.7. *Notation being as in Lemma 5.4, let further Φ, π, θ_{ijl} and X_i be as in Sections 2 and 4.*

(1) *If $n_1^3 < n_a^2$, $I = (g_1, g_2, g_3)$ with homogeneous polynomials g_1, g_2 and g_3 of degrees d_1, d_2 and d_3 ($1 \leq d_1 \leq d_2 \leq d_3$) respectively and $d_3 < d_1 + d_2 - 1$, then $[\mathrm{Im}(\Phi)]_{n_1^3 + 1} = \sum_{i=1}^{2} X_i \, [\mathrm{Im}(\Phi)]_{n_1^3} + x_3 \, [\mathrm{Im}(\Phi)]_{n_1^3}$.*

(2) *If $\#_{min}(I) \neq 3$, then $\#_{min}(I) = 5$ and $\theta_{12l} \in \sum_{i=1}^{2} X_i \, [\mathrm{Im}(\Phi)]_{n_b^3 - n_l^3 + 1} + x_3 \, [\mathrm{Im}(\Phi)]_{n_b^3 - n_l^3 + 1}$ for all $1 \leq l \leq b$.*

Proof. (1) We have $n_a^2 + 1 - n \geq 2$ by (2) of Lemma 5.6 and $n_b^3 - n_a^2 = n_1^3 - 1$ by Corollary 4.9, so that $[0 :_A x_3]_{n_1^3} = \sum_{i=1}^{2} x_i \, [0 :_A x_3]_{n_1^3 - 1}$ by (38). As in the proof of Proposition 2.5, we see that

$$\left[\mathrm{Im}^{R^\star}(\Phi/x_r)\right]_{n_1^3} \subset \sum_{i=1}^{2} X_i \left[\mathrm{Im}^{R^\star}(\Phi/x_r)\right]_{n_1^3 - 1} + [\mathrm{Im}(\Phi)]_{n_1^3},$$

from which follows our assertion.

(2) Let $\{f^1_1,\ f^2_1, \dots, f^2_a,\ f^3_1, \dots, f^3_b\}$ be a pseudo Weierstrass basis of I with respect to x_1, x_2, x_3 and let $\bar{\lambda}'_\bullet : \bar{G}'_\bullet \longrightarrow \tilde{I}/H^0_{\mathfrak{n}}(\tilde{I}) = \bar{I}$ and $\bar{\lambda}''_\bullet : \bar{G}''_\bullet \longrightarrow H^0_{\mathfrak{n}}(\tilde{I})$ be free resolutions of $\bar{I}$ and $H^0_{\mathfrak{n}}(\tilde{I})$ respectively over $\bar{R}$ such that $\bar{\lambda}'_0 = (\bar{f}^1_1\ \bar{f}^2_1\ \dots\ \bar{f}^2_a)$, $\bar{\lambda}''_0 = (\tilde{f}^3_1\ \dots\ \tilde{f}^3_b)$. Here, we can choose $\bar{\lambda}'_\bullet$ so that there is no unit in the first row of $\bar{\lambda}'_1$. Then, there is a free resolution $\lambda_\bullet : G_\bullet \longrightarrow I$ of I having the properties stated in Lemma 5.1. Since $\#_{min}(\bar{I}) = 3$ by assumption, the rank of $\bar{\lambda}'_1 \pmod{\bar{\mathfrak{m}}}$ over k is $a-2$. After a suitable column transformation of $\lambda_1|_{G'_1}$ and a change of numbering of $f^2_1, \dots, f^2_a$, if necessary, the relations given by the columns of $\lambda_1|_{G'_1}$ are of the forms

$$h_{1i}f^1_1 + \sum_{j=1}^{2} h_{j+1\,i} f^2_j + \sum_{l=1}^{b} h_{l+a+1\,i} f^3_l = 0 \quad (1 \le i \le 2),$$

$$h_{1i}f^1_1 + \sum_{j=1}^{2} h_{j+1\,i} f^2_j + f^2_i + \sum_{l=1}^{b} h_{l+a+1\,i} f^3_l = 0 \quad (3 \le i \le a).$$

Put $f'^2_i := f^2_i + \sum_{l=1}^{b} h_{l+a+1\,i} f^3_l$ for $3 \le i \le a$, $f_1 := f^1_1$, $f_2 := f^2_1$ and $f_3 := f^2_2$. Then $P := \{f^1_1,\ f^2_1, f^2_2, f'^2_3, \dots, f'^2_a,\ f^3_1, \dots, f^3_b\}$ is a pseudo Weierstrass basis of I with respect to x_1, x_2, x_3 by Lemma 3.6. We may further assume by Lemma 4.3 that $f^3_l = \sum_{i=1}^{b} \varphi_{il} \breve{g}_i$ for all $1 \le l \le b$ with the notation there. Now the sets P, $P_1 := P - \{f^3_1, \dots, f^3_b\}$ and the polynomials f_1, f_2, f_3 satisfy the conditions (i) and (ii) required in Lemma 4.4. To verify (24), recall the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow H^0_{\mathfrak{n}}(\tilde{I}) \longrightarrow \tilde{I} \longrightarrow \bar{I} \longrightarrow 0.$$

Since $\#_{min}(\bar{I}) = 3$ by hypotheses, we see $3 \le \#_{min}(\tilde{I}) = \#_{min}(I) \le 3 + 2 = 5$ by Corollary 5.2. On the other hand, $\#_{min}(I)$ must be odd since A is Gorenstein. Besides, $\#_{min}(I) \ne 3$ again by hypotheses. Hence $\#_{min}(\tilde{I}) = 5$. This implies that the sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow H^0_{\mathfrak{n}}(\tilde{I})/\mathfrak{n}H^0_{\mathfrak{n}}(\tilde{I}) \longrightarrow \tilde{I}/\mathfrak{n}\tilde{I} \longrightarrow \bar{I}/\mathfrak{n}\bar{I} \longrightarrow 0$$

is also exact. Hence the condition (24) holds and our assertion follows from Lemma 4.4. ☐

From now on through the end of this section, let the notation and the assumption be as in Lemma 5.4. Let further $\bar{g}_1$, $\bar{g}_2$ and $\bar{g}_3$ be homogeneous elements of $\bar{I}$ with $g_i \in I$ and $\deg(\bar{g}_i) = d_i$ $(i = 1, 2, 3)$ giving a system of minimal generators of $\bar{I}$. Taking the dual of the minimal free resolution described in Lemma 5.4, we get an exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \longrightarrow & \bar{R}(n^2_a + 1)/\operatorname{Im}^{\bar{R}}({}^t\Psi) \cap \bar{R}(n^2_a + 1) \xrightarrow{\iota} \operatorname{Ext}^2_{\bar{R}}(\bar{A}, \bar{R}) \\ \longrightarrow & \bar{R}(n)/(\bar{g}_{11}, \bar{g}_{12}, \bar{g}_{13}) \longrightarrow 0, \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

where ${}^t\Psi = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{g}_{11} & \bar{g}_{12} & \bar{g}_{13} \\ \bar{g}_{21} & \bar{g}_{22} & \bar{g}_{23} \end{pmatrix}$.

Lemma 5.8. *Suppose that* $n_1^3 < n_a^2$. *If* $\bar{g}_1$ *and* $\bar{g}_2$ *form an* $\bar{R}$*-regular sequence or* $\bar{g}_{13} \neq 0$, *then*

$$\operatorname{rank}_k(\bar{R}(n_a^2+1)/\operatorname{Im}^{\bar{R}}({}^t\Psi) \cap \bar{R}(n_a^2+1)) > \operatorname{rank}_k(\bar{R}(n)/(\bar{g}_{11}, \bar{g}_{12}, \bar{g}_{13})).$$

Proof. Let

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \longrightarrow \bar{R}(-\sigma_1) \oplus \bar{R}(-\sigma_2) &\xrightarrow{\Psi'} \bar{R}(d_1 - n) \oplus \bar{R}(d_2 - n) \oplus \bar{R}(d_3 - n) \\ &\xrightarrow{(\bar{g}_{11}, \bar{g}_{12}, \bar{g}_{13})} \bar{R} \longrightarrow \bar{R}/(\bar{g}_{11}, \bar{g}_{12}, \bar{g}_{13}) \longrightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

be a free resolution of $\bar{R}/(\bar{g}_{11}, \bar{g}_{12}, \bar{g}_{13})$, where $\sigma_1 \leq \sigma_2$ and ${}^t\Psi' = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{g}'_{11} & \bar{g}'_{12} & \bar{g}'_{13} \\ \bar{g}'_{21} & \bar{g}'_{22} & \bar{g}'_{23} \end{pmatrix}$.

If $\sigma_2 < n - d_1$, then $\sigma_1 < n - d_1$, $\deg(\bar{g}'_{11}) < 0$, $\deg(\bar{g}'_{21}) < 0$, and $\bar{g}'_{11} = \bar{g}'_{21} = 0$. But $\operatorname{rank} \Psi' = 2$, so that $\bar{g}_{12} = \bar{g}_{13} = 0$. Since $\operatorname{rank} \Psi = 2$, this implies that $\bar{g}_{11} \neq 0$ and that $\bar{g}_1 = 0$, which is impossible. If $\sigma_1 < n - d_2$, then $\bar{g}'_{11} = \bar{g}'_{12} = 0$, and $\bar{g}'_{13} \neq 0$, so that $\bar{g}_{13} = 0$ and $\bar{g}'_{13}$ must lie in k^*. Consequently, ${}^t\Psi = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{g}_{11} & \bar{g}_{12} & 0 \\ \bar{g}_{21} & \bar{g}_{22} & \bar{g}_{23} \end{pmatrix}$, and $\bar{g}_1 = \bar{g}_{23}\bar{g}_{12}$, $\bar{g}_2 = \bar{g}_{23}\bar{g}_{11}$ and $\bar{g}_3 = \bar{g}_{11}\bar{g}_{22} - \bar{g}_{12}\bar{g}_{21}$ up to multiplication by elements of k^*. But that cannot happen when $\bar{g}_{13} \neq 0$. In the case where $(\bar{g}_1, \bar{g}_2)$ is a complete intersection, we see $\bar{g}_{23} \in k^*$. Hence $\#_{min}(\bar{I})$ must be two, contradicting our assumption.

The above observation implies that $\sigma_2 \geq n - d_1$ and that $\sigma_1 \geq n - d_2$. Put $\tau_i := \sigma_i + n_a^2 + 1 - n$ for $i = 1, 2$. We obtain an exact sequence of the form

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \longrightarrow \bar{R}(-\tau_1 - \tau_2)(n_a^2+1) &\longrightarrow (\bar{R}(-\tau_1) \oplus \bar{R}(-\tau_2))(n_a^2+1) \\ &\xrightarrow{(\bar{g}_{21}, \bar{g}_{22}, \bar{g}_{23})\Psi'} \bar{R}(n_a^2+1) \longrightarrow \bar{R}(n_a^2+1)/\operatorname{Im}^{\bar{R}}({}^t\Psi) \cap \bar{R}(n_a^2+1) \longrightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since $n_a^2 > n_1^3$ by our hypothesis, we see $n_a^2 + 1 - n > 0$ by Lemma 5.4. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} &\operatorname{rank}_k(\bar{R}(n_a^2+1)/\operatorname{Im}^{\bar{R}}({}^t\Psi) \cap \bar{R}(n_a^2+1)) \\ &\qquad = \tau_1\tau_2 > \sigma_1\sigma_2 \geq (n - d_2)(n - d_1) \geq \operatorname{rank}_k(\bar{R}(n)/(\bar{g}_{11}, \bar{g}_{12}, \bar{g}_{13})), \end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

Lemma 5.9. *Put* $d_4 = n_1^3$ *and* $d_5 = n_b^3 - n + 2$. *If* $\deg(\gcd(g_1, g_2)) > 0$ *and* $\bar{g}_{13} = 0$, *there is a minimal free resolution of* I *over* R *of the form*

$$0 \longrightarrow R(-n_b^3 - 2) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^{5} R(-n_b^3 - 2 + d_i) \xrightarrow{\Lambda} \bigoplus_{i=1}^{5} R(-d_i) \xrightarrow{\lambda_0} I \longrightarrow 0, \tag{40}$$

where

$$\Lambda = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & * & * & h_3 & h_1 \\ * & 0 & * & h_4 & h_2 \\ * & * & 0 & h_5 & 0 \\ -h_3 & -h_4 & -h_5 & 0 & 0 \\ -h_1 & -h_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{41}$$

$g_1 = -h_2h_5$, $g_2 = h_1h_5$, $g_3 = h_2h_3 - h_1h_4$, $h_5 = \gcd(g_1, g_2)$, *and* $d_1 \leq d_2 \leq d_3 \leq d_4 \leq d_5$.

Proof. Suppose that $\deg(\gcd(g_1, g_2)) > 0$ and that $\bar{g}_{13} = 0$. Then $g_1 = -h_2 \gcd(g_1, g_2)$ and $g_2 = h_1 \gcd(g_1, g_2)$ with relatively prime homogeneous polynomials $h_1, h_2 \in R$ of positive degree. Since $\varGamma$ is sufficiently general, $\bar{h}_1$ and $\bar{h}_2$ are also relatively prime. The syzygy module

$$\mathrm{Syz}^1_{\bar{R}}(\bar{g}_1, \bar{g}_2) := \{\ (\bar{h}', \bar{h}'') \in \bar{R}(-d_1) \oplus \bar{R}(-d_2) \mid \bar{h}'\bar{g}_1 + \bar{h}''\bar{g}_2 = 0\ \}$$

is therefore generated by $(\bar{h}_1, \bar{h}_2)$. On the other hand, it is also generated by $(\bar{g}_{11}, \bar{g}_{12})$ since $\bar{g}_{13} = 0$ by our hypothesis. Hence $(\bar{h}_1, \bar{h}_2)$ coincides with $(\bar{g}_{11}, \bar{g}_{12})$ up to multiplication by a constant and $\deg(\bar{h}_i) = \deg(\bar{g}_{1i})$ for $i = 1, 2$. In consequence, $\deg(g_1h_1) = \deg(g_2h_2) = n$. Besides, $\bar{g}_{23} = \gcd(\bar{g}_1, \bar{g}_2)$ up to multiplication by a constant.

By what we have seen in the proof of Lemmas 4.1 and by (27),

$$\bigoplus_{l=1}^{b} k(-n^3_l) \cong \bigoplus_{l=1}^{b} k\tilde{f}^3_l = H^0_{\mathfrak{n}}(\tilde{I}) \cong \mathrm{Ext}^2_{\bar{R}}(\bar{R}/\bar{I}, \bar{R})(-n^3_b - 2), \tag{42}$$

since $\mathrm{Tor}^{R^\star}_1(A, \bar{R}^\star) \cong (0 :_A x_3)(-1)$. By (35) and (42), $H^0_{\mathfrak{n}}(\tilde{I})$ is generated minimally by two elements. Let g_4 and g_5 be elements of $I^{\langle 3\rangle}$ with $\deg(g_4) \leq \deg(g_5)$ such that $\tilde{g}_4$ and $\tilde{g}_5$ generate $H^0_{\mathfrak{n}}(\tilde{I})$ minimally over $\bar{R}$. Here $\deg(g_4) = n^3_1$ and $\deg(g_5) = n^3_b - n + 2$ by (42). Since $\deg(\gcd(g_1, g_2)) > 0$ by our hypothesis, $\#_{min}(I) \neq 3$. Hence $\#_{min}(I) = 5$ by (2) of Lemma 5.7 and I is generated minimally by g_i $(1 \leq i \leq 5)$ over R. Notice that $d_1 \leq d_2 \leq \deg(g_i)$ for all $i = 3, 4, 5$ by Lemma 5.4. With the use of Lemma 5.1, we find that there is a surjection

$$R(-n) \oplus R(-n^2_a - 1) \oplus \bigoplus_{j=1}^{3} R(-n^3_1 - \deg(\bar{g}_{2j})) \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{Syz}^1_R(I) := \mathrm{Ker}^R(\lambda_0).$$

Since $\deg(\bar{g}_{2j}) > 0$ for all $i = 1, 2, 3$, we have $n = \min\{\ l \mid \left[\mathrm{Syz}^1_R(I)\right]_l \neq 0\ \}$ by Lemma 5.4.

On the other hand, since A is Gorenstein, there is a minimal free resolution of I of the form

$$0 \longrightarrow R(-\beta) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^{5} R(-\beta + \alpha_i) \xrightarrow{\varLambda} \bigoplus_{i=1}^{5} R(-\alpha_i) \longrightarrow I \longrightarrow 0 \tag{43}$$

with an alternating matrix $\varLambda$, where $0 < \alpha_1 = d_1 \leq d_2 = \alpha_2 \leq \cdots \leq \alpha_5$ (see [6, Theorem 2.1]). Since ${}^t(h_1, h_2, 0, 0, 0)$ lies in $\left[\mathrm{Syz}^1_R(I)\right]_n$, we may assume with no loss of generality that $\varLambda$ is of the form (41). Put $g'_1 := -h_2h_5$, $g'_2 := h_1h_5$, $g'_3 := h_2h_3 - h_1h_4$ and $J := (g'_1, g'_2, g'_3)$. Then $\mathrm{Pfaff}(\varLambda\binom{i}{i})$ equals g'_i up to multiplication by a constant respectively for $i = 1, 2, 3$, where $\Lambda\binom{i}{j}$ denotes the square matrix obtained from Λ by deleting its i-th row and j-th column. Hence $J \subset I$. Notice that $\deg(g_i') = d_i$ for $i = 1, 2$ and that $\deg(h_5) = \deg(g_1') - \deg(h_2) = d_1 - \deg(h_2) = \deg(\gcd(g_1, g_2)) > 0$. If $\mathrm{ht}(J) \leq 1$, then there is an irreducible polynomial h' dividing h_5 such that (h_1, h_2) and (h_3, h_4) (mod (h')) are linearly dependent over $R/(h')$. In this case, $\mathrm{ht}(I)$ cannot be three since I is generated by $\mathrm{Pfaff}(\Lambda\binom{i}{i})$ $(1 \leq i \leq 5)$. Hence $\mathrm{ht}(J) = 2$. In consequence, $\mathrm{ht}(\bar{J}) = 2$ and $\mathrm{Syz}^1_{\bar{R}}(\bar{J})$ is generated by ${}^t(\bar{h}_1, \bar{h}_2, 0)$ and ${}^t(\bar{h}_3, \bar{h}_4, \bar{h}_5)$, so that $\bar{I} \ni \bar{g}_3' \notin (\bar{g}_1', \bar{g}_2')$. If $\deg(g_3) = d_3 > \alpha_3 = \deg(\bar{g}_3')$, then $(\bar{g}_1', \bar{g}_2')$ must coincide with $(\bar{g}_1, \bar{g}_2)$, since $(\bar{g}_1', \bar{g}_2') \subset \bar{I} = (\bar{g}_1, \bar{g}_2, \bar{g}_3)$ and $\deg(\bar{g}_i') = d_i$ $(i = 1, 2)$. In addition, $\bar{g}_3'$ must be contained in $(\bar{g}_1, \bar{g}_2) = (\bar{g}_1', \bar{g}_2')$, which is a contradiction. This implies that $\alpha_3 \geq d_3$. But d_3 coincides with some α_i with $i \geq 3$. Hence $\alpha_3 = d_3$. Moreover $\alpha_4 = \deg(g_4) = n_1^3$ and $\alpha_5 = \deg(g_5) = n_b^3 - n + 2$. Since $\bar{J} \subset \bar{I}$, $\deg(\bar{g}_i') = d_i$ $(i = 1, 2, 3)$, and $\bar{J}$ is generated minimally by $\bar{g}_1', \bar{g}_2', \bar{g}_3'$ over $\bar{R}$, one sees that $\bar{J} = \bar{I}$. One may therefore assume from the first that $\bar{g}_i' = \bar{g}_i$, $g_i' = g_i$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Finally, $\mathrm{socd}(A) = n_b^3 - 1 = \beta - 3$. Thus the free resolution (43) is of the desired form (40). ☐

Lemma 5.10. *Suppose that* $\deg(\gcd(g_1, g_2)) > 0$ *and that* $\bar{g}_{13} = 0$. *With the notation of Lemma 5.9, put* $J := (g_1, g_2, g_3) \subset I$. *Then* $R/J \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{b} R^\star(-n_b^3 + n_i^3)$ *and* $I/J \cong \mathrm{Ext}^2_R(R/J, R)(-\mathrm{socd}(A) - 3) \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{b} R^\star(-n_i^3)$ *as* $R^\star$*-modules, and as a minimal free resolution of* A *over* $R^\star$ *of the form* (25), *we have*

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^2_R(R/J, R)(-\mathrm{socd}(A) - 3) \xrightarrow{\Phi} R/J \xrightarrow{\pi} A \longrightarrow 0, \tag{44}$$

where π *is the natural surjection from* R/J *to* $A = R/I$ *and* Φ *is the map induced from the embedding* $I/J \hookrightarrow R/J$. *Moreover* $X_1X_2 = X_2X_1$ *and* $Y_1Y_2 = Y_2Y_1$ *with the notation of Section 4.*

Proof. We have an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow I/J \xrightarrow{\Phi} R/J \xrightarrow{\pi} A \longrightarrow 0$$

over R with the natural surjection π and the embedding Φ. Since R/J is Cohen-Macaulay with $0 :_{R/J} x_3 = 0$, it is free over $R^\star$. Hence I/J is also free over $R^\star$. Moreover, since $\bar{J} = (\bar{g}_1, \bar{g}_2, \bar{g}_3) = \bar{I}$, the homomorphism $\pi \otimes \bar{R}^\star : R/J \otimes \bar{R}^\star \longrightarrow \bar{A}$ is an isomorphism. The image of Φ is therefore contained in $x_3(R/J)$ and the above free resolution is minimal over $R^\star$. Since R/J is a module over R, the matrix X_j can be chosen so that it represents the linear map $\times x_j : (R/J)(-1) \longrightarrow R/J$ over $R^\star$. Hence the relations $X_1X_2 = X_2X_1$ and $Y_1Y_2 = Y_2Y_1$ hold. Taking the dual over $R^\star$ of the above free resolution, we obtain the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow (R/J)^\vee \xrightarrow{{}^t\Phi} (I/J)^\vee \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^1_{R^\star}(A, R^\star) \cong A(\mathrm{socd}(A) + 1) \longrightarrow 0 \tag{45}$$

over R, where the structures of $(R/J)^\vee$, $(I/J)^\vee$ and $\mathrm{Ext}^1_{R^\star}(A, R^\star)$ over R are induced from those of R/J, I/J and A respectively in a standard way. Since A is generated by a single element over R, so is $(I/J)^\vee$ by the minimal free resolution (45) over $R^\star$. On the other hand, $\mathrm{ann}((I/J)^\vee) \subset \mathrm{ann}((R/J)^\vee)$, since ${}^t\varPhi$ is injective. Besides, $J \subset \mathrm{ann}((I/J)^\vee)$ and $\mathrm{ann}((R/J)^\vee) \subset \mathrm{ann}((R/J)^{\vee\vee}) = \mathrm{ann}(R/J) = J$. Hence $\mathrm{ann}((I/J)^\vee) = J$, that is, $(I/J)^\vee \cong (R/J)(\mathrm{socd}(A) + 1)$. In consequence,

$$I/J = (I/J)^{\vee\vee} \cong \mathrm{Ext}^2_R(R/J, R)(-\mathrm{socd}(A) - 3),$$

which proves our assertion. □

Theorem 5.11. *Let I be a homogeneous ideal in R defining Gorenstein graded ring $A := R/I$ of dimension zero. Suppose that* $\mathrm{char}(k) = 0$. *If $r = 3$ and $\#_{min}(0 :_A x_3) \le 2$, then A has the WLP.*

Proof. Assume that $r = 3$ and that $\varGamma$ is chosen sufficiently generally. We have $\#_{min}(\bar{I}) \ge 2$ since $\mathrm{ht}(\bar{I}) = 2$. Besides, the condition $\#_{min}(0 :_A x_3) \le 2$ is equivalent to $\#_{min}(\bar{I}) \le 3$. Let $(a; n^2_1, \ldots, n^2_a; n^3_1, \ldots, n^3_b)$ be the basic sequence of I. By Lemma 4.6, it is enough to show that $n^3_1 \ge n^2_a$.

Case (i). Consider first the case $\#_{min}(\bar{I}) = 2$. With the use of Corollary 5.2, we see $\#_{min}(I) = 3$. As we have already seen in (1) of Lemma 5.6, $n^3_1 \ge n^2_a$.

Now assume that $\#_{min}(\bar{I}) = 3$ and let g_i, $\bar{g}_i$, d_i and $\bar{g}_{ij}$ be as stated just before Lemma 5.8. We will show that we are led to a contradiction if $n^3_1 < n^2_a$.

As in Section 4, put $L := \bigoplus_{i=1}^b R^\star(-n^3_b + n^3_i)$, $F := \bigoplus_{i=1}^b R^\star(-n^3_i)$, $\bar{L} := L/x_3L = \bigoplus_{i=1}^b k(-n^3_b + n^3_i)$, and $\bar{F} := F/x_3F = \bigoplus_{i=1}^b k(-n^3_i)$, and denote the canonical basis of $\bar{L}$ (resp. $\bar{F}$) by $\{\bar{e}^L_1, \ldots, \bar{e}^L_b\}$ (resp. $\{\bar{e}^F_1, \ldots, \bar{e}^F_b\}$). Suppose that $n^3_1 < n^2_a$. Put $p := \max\{\, i \mid n^3_1 - n^3_b + n^3_i \le 0,\ 1 \le i \le b \,\}$ and $\check{p} := \max\{\, i \mid n^3_i - n^3_b + n^3_p \le 0,\ 1 \le i \le b \,\}$. Since $n^3_b - n^3_1 = n^2_a - 1$ by Corollary 4.9 and $n^3_1 < n^2_a$ by our assumption, we have $p \ge 1$ and $\check{p} \ge 1$. Besides $p < b$, since $n^3_1 > 0$. Moreover, the sequence $-n^3_b + n^3_i$ $(1 \le i \le b)$ ranges over all integers from $-n^3_b + n^3_1$ to 0 as stated in Lemma 4.1, therefore $n^3_1 = n^3_b - n^3_p$. Put $q := \max\{\ j \mid n^3_{p+1} = n^3_{p+j},\ 1 \le j \le b - p\ \}$. For every $p + 1 \le l \le p + q$, we have $n^3_p < n^3_l$, so that $n^3_b - n^3_p \ge n^3_b - n^3_l + 1$. With the use of Lemma 5.7, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
&[\mathrm{Im}(\varPhi)]_{n^3_b - n^3_{p+1} + 2} \\
&\qquad \subset [\mathrm{Im}(\varPhi)]_{\le n^3_b - n^3_p + 1} \subset R^\star[X_1, X_2]\,[\mathrm{Im}(\varPhi)]_{\le n^3_b - n^3_p} \quad \text{or} \\
&\theta_{12l} \in R^\star[X_1, X_2]\,[\mathrm{Im}(\varPhi)]_{\le n^3_b - n^3_p} \quad \text{for all } p + 1 \le l \le p + q.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus $R^\star[X_1, X_2]\,[\mathrm{Im}(\varPhi)]_{\le n^3_1} = R^\star[X_1, X_2]\,[\mathrm{Im}(\varPhi)]_{\le n^3_b - n^3_p} \subset N_p$ by Corollary 2.4 or Theorem 2.3. Observe that the polynomials $\bar{g}_1$ and $\bar{g}_2$ form an $\bar{R}$ regular sequence unless $\deg(\gcd(g_1, g_2)) > 0$, since $\varGamma$ is sufficiently general.

Case (ii). Suppose that $\bar{g}_1$ and $\bar{g}_2$ form an $\bar{R}$-regular sequence or that $\bar{g}_{13} \neq 0$. With the help of (31), (39) and Lemma 5.8, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} b &= \operatorname{rank}_k(\operatorname{Ext}^2_{\bar{R}}(\bar{A}, \bar{R})) \\ &= \operatorname{rank}_k(\bar{R}(n_a^2+1)/\operatorname{Im}^{\bar{R}}({}^t\Psi) \cap \bar{R}(n_a^2+1)) + \operatorname{rank}_k(\bar{R}(n)/(\bar{g}_{11}, \bar{g}_{12}, \bar{g}_{13})) \\ &< 2\operatorname{rank}_k(\bar{R}(n_a^2+1)/\operatorname{Im}^{\bar{R}}({}^t\Psi) \cap \bar{R}(n_a^2+1)). \end{aligned}$$

Let us consider $\bar{M}_{3,1}$ defined in Section 4. We have $\bar{M}_{3,1} = k[\bar{Y}_1, \bar{Y}_2]\bar{e}_1^F \subset \bar{F} \cong (0 :_A x_3)(-1) \cong \operatorname{Ext}^2_{\bar{R}}(\bar{A}, \bar{R})(-n_b^3 - 2)$. Recall that the multiplication by $\bar{Y}_i$ corresponds to that by x_i for $i = 1, 2$. Let $e \neq 0$ be a homogeneous element of $\bar{R}(n_a^2+1)/\operatorname{Im}^{\bar{R}}({}^t\Psi) \cap \bar{R}(n_a^2+1)$ of degree $-(n_a^2+1)$ which generate this module over $\bar{R}$. When considered in $\operatorname{Ext}^2_{\bar{R}}(\bar{A}, \bar{R})(-n_b^3 - 2)$, the element $\iota(e)$ (see (39)) is of the minimal degree since $-n > -(n_a^2+1)$ by Lemma 5.4, with $\deg(\iota(e)) = -(n_a^2+1) + n_b^3 + 2 = n_1^3$ by Corollary 4.9. Hence $\bar{M}_{3,1} = \bar{R} \cdot \iota(e) \cong \bar{R}(n_a^2+1)/\operatorname{Im}^{\bar{R}}({}^t\Psi) \cap \bar{R}(n_a^2+1)$. On the other hand, $\bar{M}_{3,1} \cong \bar{M}_{2,1}$ by (32), so that

$$2\operatorname{rank}_k(\bar{M}_{3,1}) \leq \operatorname{rank}_k(\bar{M}_{3,\check{p}}) + \operatorname{rank}_k(\bar{M}_{2,p}) \leq b$$

by Lemma 4.13, which is a contradiction.

Case (iii). Suppose that $\deg(\gcd(g_1, g_2)) > 0$ and that $\bar{g}_{13} = 0$. Let $J = (g_1, g_2, g_3) = (-h_2h_5, h_1h_5, h_2h_3 - h_1h_4)$ be as in Lemma 5.9. Since J has a minimal free resolution

$$0 \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{i=4}^{5} R(-n_b^3 - 2 + d_i) \xrightarrow{\Lambda'} \bigoplus_{i=1}^{3} R(-d_i) \longrightarrow J \longrightarrow 0$$

with $\Lambda' := \left[\begin{smallmatrix} h_3 & h_1 \\ h_4 & h_2 \\ h_5 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right]$ by (40) and since $\operatorname{socd}(A) = n_b^3 - 1$, there is an exact sequences

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \longrightarrow\ & (R/(h_5, h_2h_3 - h_1h_4))(-d_4) \\ & \longrightarrow \operatorname{Ext}^2_R(R/J, R)(-\operatorname{socd}(A) - 3) \longrightarrow (R/(h_1, h_2))(-d_5) \longrightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

We consider $M_{1,1}$, $M_{2,1}$ and $M_{3,1}$ with the use of (44). In this case, $L = R/J$, $F = \operatorname{Ext}^2_R(R/J, R)(-\operatorname{socd}(A) - 3)$, $X_1X_2 = X_2X_1$ and $Y_1Y_2 = Y_2Y_1$. The $R^\star$-modules L, $L^\vee$ and F are therefore modules over $R = R^\star[x_1, x_2]$ through the surjections $R^\star[x_1, x_2] \twoheadrightarrow R^\star[X_1, X_2]$, $R^\star[x_1, x_2] \twoheadrightarrow R^\star[{}^tX_1, {}^tX_2]$ and $R^\star[x_1, x_2] \twoheadrightarrow R^\star[Y_1, Y_2]$ respectively. So are $M_{1,1}$, $M_{2,1}$ and $M_{3,1}$. Since $d_5 = n_b^3 - n + 2 > n_b^3 - (n_a^2+1) + 2 = n_1^3 = d_4$ by Corollary 4.9 and Lemmas 5.4 and 5.9, we find that $M_{3,1} \cong (R/(h_5, h_2h_3 - h_1h_4))(-d_4)$ over R. Since $L^\vee = (R/J)^\vee \cong \operatorname{Ext}^2_R(R/J, R)(-2) = F(n_b^3)$ over R, we see $M_{2,1} \cong M_{3,1}(n_b^3)$. On the other hand, since $M_{1,1} = \Phi M_{3,1}$ and $\Phi : F \longrightarrow L$ is injective, we have $(R/(h_1, h_2))(-d_5) \cong F/M_{3,1} \hookrightarrow L/M_{1,1}$. Notice that $x_3^{\nu_0}(L/M_{1,1}) \subset \Phi(F/M_{3,1})$ for some $\nu_0 > 0$ since $\det(\Phi) \neq 0$. Hence $(L/M_{1,1})^\vee \hookrightarrow (F/M_{3,1})^\vee \cong (R/(h_1, h_2))^\vee(d_5)$. Moreover, there is an injective map $\eta : M_{2,1} \hookrightarrow (L/M_{1,1})^{\vee}$ by Lemma 4.12 and Theorem 2.3. Since $(R/(h_1, h_2))^{\vee} \cong \mathrm{Ext}^2_R(R/(h_1, h_2), R) \cong R/(h_1, h_2)$ up to shift in grading, we find in this manner that there is an injective homomorphism $\eta' : R/(h_5, h_2h_3 - h_1h_4) \longrightarrow R/(h_1, h_2)$ over R, forgetting shift of gradings. Since $h_1\eta'(1) = h_2\eta'(1) = 0$, it must hold that $h_1, h_2 \in (h_5, h_2h_3 - h_1h_4)$. But, then, $h_1, h_2 \in (h_5)$. Since $\gcd(h_1, h_2) \in k^*$, the degree of h_5 must be zero, which contradicts our assumption that $\deg(\gcd(g_1, g_2)) > 0$. $\square$

§6. The basic sequence of a complete intersection of three homogeneous polynomials

Let $g_1, g_2, g_3 \in R := k[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ be homogeneous polynomials of degrees d_1, d_2, d_3 respectively with $2 \le d_1 \le d_2 \le d_3$ which form an R-regular sequence and let $I := (g_1, g_2, g_3) \subset R$. In this section, we give an explicit description of $B_R(I)$ for the case $d_3 < d_1 + d_2 - 1$. When $d_3 \ge d_1 + d_2 - 1$, we have $B_R(I) \overset{\mathrm{p}}{=} B^0$ as have already been proved in (1) of Lemma 5.6.

Lemma 6.1. *Let* $B = (\alpha; \nu^2_1, \dots, \nu^2_\alpha; \nu^3_1, \dots, \nu^3_\beta)$ *be a sequence of integers such that* $\nu^2_l = \nu^3_{l'} + 1$ *for some* $1 \le l \le \alpha$, $1 \le l' \le \beta$. *Then*

$$B \sim (\alpha; \nu^2_1, \dots, \nu^2_{l-1}, \nu^3_{l'}, \nu^2_{l+1}, \dots, \nu^2_\alpha; \nu^3_1, \dots, \nu^3_{l'-1}, \nu^3_{l'+1}, \dots, \nu^3_\beta).$$

Proof. Our assertion follows from the equality

$$\binom{\mu - \nu^2_l + 1}{1}_+ + \binom{\mu - \nu^3_{l'}}{0}_+ = \binom{\mu - \nu^3_{l'}}{1}_+ + \binom{\mu - \nu^3_{l'}}{0}_+ = \binom{\mu - \nu^3_{l'} + 1}{1}_+$$

for all $\mu \in \mathbf{Z}$. $\square$

We will denote the sequence $(l, l, \dots, l)$ (μ times) by l^μ for $l \in \mathbf{Z}$, $\mu \in \mathbf{N}$. When $d_3 < d_1 + d_2 - 1$ and $d_1 + d_2 - d_3 \ge 2c$ with $c \in \mathbf{N}$, we put

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\nu}^{c2} := (&d_2, d_2 + 1, \dots, d_3 - 1, (d_3)^2, (d_3 + 1)^2, \dots, (d_3 + c - 1)^2,\\
&d_3 + c, d_3 + c + 1, \dots, d_2 + d_1 - c - 1),\\
\bar{\nu}^{c3} := (&(d_2 + d_1 - 1, d_2 + d_1, \dots, d_3 + d_1 - 1),\\
&(d_2 + d_1 - 2, d_2 + d_1 - 1, \dots, d_3 + d_1),\\
&(d_2 + d_1 - 3, d_2 + d_1 - 2, \dots, d_3 + d_1 + 1),\\
&\cdots,\\
&(d_2 + d_1 - c, d_2 + d_1 - c + 1, \dots, d_3 + d_1 + c - 2),\\
&((d_3 + j, d_3 + 1 + j, \dots, d_3 + d_1 - 1 + j))_{c \le j \le d_2 - 1}),
\end{aligned}$$

and $B^c := (d_1; \bar{\nu}^{c2}; \bar{\nu}^{c3})$, where

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\nu}^{c2} := (&(d_3)^2, (d_3+1)^2, \dots, (d_3+c-1)^2,\\ &d_3+c, d_3+c+1, \dots, d_3+d_1-c-1)\end{aligned}$$

if $d_2 = d_3$. Note that $c \le d_2 - 1$.

Lemma 6.2. *Suppose that* $d_3 < d_1 + d_2 - 1$ *and that* $d_1 + d_2 - d_3 \ge 2c$ *with* $c \in \mathbf{N}$. *Then* $B^0 \sim B^c$.

Proof. Since $d_3 < d_1 + d_2 - 1$, the sequence $(d_3+1, d_3+2, \dots, d_2+d_1-1)$ (resp. $(d_3, d_3+1, \dots, d_2+d_1-2)$) is a subsequence of $\bar{\nu}^{02}$ (resp. $\bar{\nu}^{03}$). Using Lemma 6.1 $d_2 + d_1 - d_3 - 1$ times, we find that $B^0 \sim B^1$. If $c \ge 2$, then $d_3 + 1 < d_1 + d_2 - 2$, so that we can repeat the same procedure as above to get $B^1 \sim B^2$. Hence $B^0 \sim B^2$. Proceeding in this way, we obtain $B^0 \sim B^c$. □

Theorem 6.3. *Suppose that* $d_3 < d_1 + d_2 - 1$ *and let* c *be the unique positive integer such that* $2c \le d_1 + d_2 - d_3 \le 2c + 1$. *Then* $B_R(I) \overset{\mathrm{p}}{=} B^c$.

Proof. The maximal term of $\bar{\nu}^{c2}$ is $d_2 + d_1 - c - 1$ and the minimal term of $\bar{\nu}^{c3}$ is $d_3 + c$. Their difference $(d_3 + c) - (d_2 + d_1 - c - 1)$ is not negative by the choice of c, so that $d_2 + d_1 - c - 1 \le d_3 + c$. As for $B_R(I)$, one has $n_a^2 \le n_1^3$ by Lemma 4.6 and Theorem 5.11. On the other hand $B^0 \sim B^c$ by Lemma 6.2 and $B_R(I) \sim B^0$ by Lemma 5.5. Hence $B_R(I) \sim B^c$. Comparing $h_{B_R(I)}(\mu)$ and $h_{B^c}(\mu)$ ($\mu \in \mathbf{Z}$), one finds that $B_R(I) \overset{\mathrm{p}}{=} B^c$. □

References

[1] J. Ahn, Y. H. Cho and J. P. Park, *Generic initial ideals of artinian ideals having Lefschetz properties or the strong Stanley property*, J. Algebra **318** (2007), 589 – 606.

[2] M. Amasaki, *Application of the generalized Weierstrass preparation theorem to the study of homogeneous ideals*, Trans. AMS **317** (1990), 1 – 43.

[3] M. Amasaki, *Generators of graded modules associated with linear filter-regular sequences*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **114** (1996), 1 – 23.

[4] M. Amasaki, *Generic Gröbner bases and Weierstrass bases of homogeneous submodules of graded free modules*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **152** (2000), 3 – 16.

[5] M. Amasaki, *Inequalities satisfied by the basic sequence of an integral curve in* $\mathbf{P}^3$, arXiv.org e-Print archive, math.AC/0504131, April 2005.

[6] D. A. Buchsbaum and D. Eisenbud, *Algebra structures for finite free resolutions and some structure theorems for ideals of codimension 3*, Amer. J. Math. **99** (1977), 447 – 485.

[7] T. Harima, J. C. Migliore, U. Nagel and J. Watanabe, *The weak and strong Lefschetz properties for Artinian K-algebras*, J. Algebra **262** (2003), 99 – 126.

[8] C. Huneke and B. Ulrich, *General hyperplane sections of algebraic varieties*, J. Alg. Geom. **2** (1993), 487 – 505.

[9] J. Migliore and F. Zanello, *The strength of the weak Lefschetz property*, Illinois J. Math. **52** (2008), 1417 – 1433.

[10] J. Watanabe, *A note on complete intersections of height three*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **126** (1998), 3161 – 3168.